A TREATISE INTITLED, BEWARE OF M. IEWEL. BY Iohn Rastel MASTER OF ARTE AND STVDENT OF DIVINITIE.

Math. 7.

Beware of false Prophets, which come vnto you in the cotes of sheepe, but inwardlye are rauening wolues, &c.

Basil: HC
8° R. 82. Th.
188



ANTVERPIAE
Ex officina Ioannis Foulerij.
M. D. LXVI.

To the Indifferent Reader.

THE VVorthinesse of a certaine boke, lately set furth in the name of M. IeVVel, doth in England perchaunse, make it to be pretious Vnto many, but Vnto Vs that are in these partes of beyond the Seas, the Raritie only thereof, gaue a Price and Value Vnto it. In so much that receiuing one of them for my selfe, two monthes (at the least) after they had bene abrode in Englande, I could not keepe the whole altogeather to my selfe, but was faine to diuide it in the middle. And yet there was no losse therein, because a frind was gratified with that halfe whiche I mighte spare, and the other remaining with me woulde keepe me so long occupied, Vntill both of Vs might chaunge partes one with the other, and I (if I thoughte good) continue my reading forwarde as I had begon without any Interruption or stay at all. But I savv such geare and such store therof, in the one halfe only, that I had litle mind to goe through the other. And now that diuiding of the Booke into tvvo partes vvhich the Rarietie thereof occasioned me to make not altogeather so vvillingly, but that I could haue vvished it better, that same novv fell out so happely and agreably:

my purpoſe, that although I might conſider and ſee, vvhat ſtuffing vvere in the vvhole, yet, of free choiſe and for good cauſes, I vvould meddle vvith no more then the halfe. And truly, to chooſe vvho can let me, except ſome ſuch vnreaſonable Heretike as taketh all freevvill avvay, frō a man? Mary to chooſe any one vvay, of tvvo that may be taken, that may be reproued in the Chooſer, except the cauſes vvhich he folovved, be alovvable. In the ſeeking of vvhich, leaſt any man ſhould extend his vvit ſo much, that by long diſcourſing he ſhould make it the leſſer and vveaker, and imagine vvith himſelfe, vpon Secrete Conferences, Policies, Concluſions and Orders made among the Catholikes, for the anſvvering of their Aduerſaries: I vvill therefore ſhortly and faithfully tell them my ſelfe.

Firſt in foure Articles only, vvhich occupy vvel nere halfe the Reply, I foūd ſo much mater vvorth the briefe noting, that it vvould fully ſerue to the making of a iuſt boke. Concerning then the qualitie of thoſe thinges, it vvas ſo corrupt and infectuous, that it required ſome preſent and ſpedy preſeruatiue againſt it. I prouided alſo that the reader ſhould not be vvearied through any lōg proceſſe or diſcourſe. Furthermore, if M. Ievvel himſelf, in this vacation and leiſure of his vntill

D. Har-

D. Harding come vpon him againe, or if any other of the right Iannizers in deede vvhich haue fled from the Catholike faith, vvould make me an Answer: I thought good so to measure out my Booke vnto them, that they should not put the faulte in the greatnesse therof, vvhen they do not in conuenient time say their minde vnto me for it. Byside this, the chiefe poyntes vvhich I did minde to speake of are such, that if I vvould haue perused the vvhole Reply, yet I should haue brought but more Examples only to the prouing of those my Obiections against M. Ievvel, vvhich already are declared by inough and sufficient. And to Conclude I say only BEWARE OF M. IEWEL, that is, I shevv good causes to the Indifferent Reader, vvherfore he should try him thrise, before he trust him once: Other are comming, vvhich shall bring him to more ieobardy, & strike directly at that crafty head of his, as if they should say, NOW M. IEWEL BEWARE.

Other causes therefore contrary to these, vvho so euer shall name, he shall not expound my intent and meaning, but open his ovvne euil minde and suspitions. And I trust, as these seemed probable inough vnto me, vvherefore I might and shoulde gather certaine thinges (vvhat I vvould my selfe) out of M. Ievvels boke, and dispose them as I haue

done, so may any Reasonable man be coutent vvith this, vvhich for his vvarning sake I haue noted and neuer think, that M. Ievvel is not touched because euery Article of his is not by me discussed: Or that, for all this vvhich yet is said, he must not be mistrusted, because euery line and sentence of his boke is not Answvered.

For euery man, as he is vvel disposed, so may he doe: and vvhat so euer vvay, close or Open, frequented or Solitary, Short or Long, Direct forvvard, or about, Easy or Intricate, vvhat so euer vvay be taken, if vve come to one end, and meete togeather in the discouering of Craft or Heresye, the cause of the Catholikes is the stronger, the hartes of the Protestantes may be the fainter.

Some one (perchaunse) hath a patient minde to folovvè M. Ievvel, Sentence by Sentence: An other vvill not be bound to goe after him vppon euery trifeling Occasion, but leauing bymatters and impertinent, gathereth out his Sense and confuteth it: Some againe chooseth one Speciall Article out, and spedely Answvereth it, An other is not content vvith so fevv as one or tvvo, and therefore is longer a doing. There is that thinketh it inough to Iustifye the vntruthes that D. Harding is charged vvithall. That seemeth not

inoughe

inough to an other, but he noteth M. Ievvel for his plaine lies, and them out of measure. VVhat shall I say more of other? My selfe haue folovved an order much different from any the forsaid, and no doubt, but an other may come after all that is hitherto reckened, and finde more matter againste M. Ievvel vvith a peculiar disposition thereof.

Let the vvay therefore, vvhich any man taketh be neuer condemned, but the end to vvhich he bringeth processes, let that be considered.

M. Ievvel (I speake it vvithout flattery) hath a Rare gift in vvryting, he must not be proude of it. He ventereth so boldlye, he fighteth so openly, and is armed so singlely, that if tvventye Catholikes should at one time encountre vvith him, no one shoulde neede to strike in the same place that an other dothe, nor faile so to strike him that his credite and cause shoulde be vvounded. Yet, to them that stand a farre of from the sight of the mater, he is harnessed so finely, he handeleth his vveapon so cunninglye, he chaungeth from one hand to an other so readely, yea shrinketh and geaueth backe so Artificiallye, that he may vvell seeme to haue done a greate Acte, and to make it doubtfull at the least, vvho hath the victorie.

And ſo concerning theſe tvvo poyntes, becauſe of the firſt, I may lavvfully take my vantage: And though in moſt places I leaue him vntouched, in other yet, (except he be vnſenſible) I doe inough to make him feele it. Then becauſe of the ſecond, I geue thee (Indifferent Reader) lavvfull vvarning, that of all men that euer hitherto haue vvryten, he is the moſt Bragging, Deceitfull, and Impudent.

Hovv true this is, it ſhall appeere by my profes: And the profes hovv ready they are, it is euident in this preſent Treatiſe, and ſhall further appeere by an other vvhich is furth cumming. Concerning this vvhich is Printed:

In the firſt boke therof, I haue brought into a ſhort Table or Sum, (as it vvere) the State of the Queſtion conteined in euery of the foure firſt Articles: The Art of M. Ievvel, in ſauing himſelf from Subſcription in euery one: And the Iſſue of the Cõtrouerſy, vpõ vvhich a more direct Anſvver is to be required, and more Iuſt reply to be inferred. And in peruſing of this part, it vvill be quickly ſeene, vvhether I ſlaunder M. Ievvel, in charging him vvith Shifting, Falſifing, Corrupting, and Deſperate handeling of ſuch matters as come againſt him, Or no.

In the ſecond boke, I come to more particular poyntes,

poyntes, And declare in seuerall Chapters, by most manifest Examples:

That he hath ouercharged his Boke vvith Common Places, needlesse, but harmelesse. 1.

That he starteth into Digressions, Impure, and fruteleſſe. 2.

That he troubleth Consciencies, vvith other Common places, so fruteleſſe, that they vvill make them faithleſſe. 3.

That he peruerteth D. Hardinges meaning. 4.

That he disgraceth his Authorities. 5.

That he vvrangleth vvith him. 6.

That he dissembleth, or Butteth vvith him. 7.

That he refelleth one Trueth by an other. 8.

That he reporteth of him very vncourteously, 9.

By all vvhich Euidences, if it be not sufficiently proued, that he is a man of little Modesty, Truthe, and Conscience, I vvill shortly set furth a thirde boke against him. In vvhich, the abusing of sundry Doctours, and vvryters Authorities, to the maintenance of his falseheade, and Heresy, &c. shalbe so plainly exemplified, that (I trust) it vvill be considered as a true and profitable Conclusion: BEVVARE OF M. IEVVEL.

But novv, after all these paines taken, sometimes gladly, sometimes patientlye, but alvvayes faithfully: and that to this end, that Truthe might

be

be knovven, And falsehead detected, And that the nevve Doctrine of the late Gospell might, either best of all be forsaken, or els be better examined: Are there none or very fevve, that vvill take the paines to reade our Bookes? Or if there be, that vvould gladly reade them, or vvith indifferencye iudge of them, is it not lavvfull to bring some in for thē? VVhat haue the Catholikes done of late, so vnnaturally, or vnreasonablye, that from hencefurth they must vvryte no more against the Chalenger? Or feare, that if they doe vvryte, the Vattes shall be searched vvhich bring in the Bookes, and the Bookes not examined, that bring in the Argumentes? Is it for our person sake or our cause sake that vve are so excluded? Is the place from vvhence vve vvryte, or the matter vvhyche vve vvryte, cōdemned of you?

It is obiected vnto vs, that we are yonge Dyuines. The Obiection vvere good if vve solovved the deuises of our ovvne heades, and not the lerned Commentaries of most Auncient Fathers. But novv the person is young, the Conclusion is old. And againe, the youngest dyuine emong vs that haue vvryten, might fiue yeres sense, haue proceded (vvithout Grace asking) and haue gone for a Doctour (if it had so liked him) in any of this Ages heresies for any exception that vvoulde haue bene made

made, against his Age, or lerning. Not only as Doctours are made in the Country abrode, vvhere he that can Read best, Or say vvithout Boke most, Or Rovvle in Termes most fast, Or Rayle (in deede) most loud, is Created a Doctour for his labour; but as Doctors allso are made at these daies in Vniuersities by Disputing, Answvering and Grace taking.

But vve are not the wisest of all the Catholikes. We may borovv then of our ovvn Company, and neuer be in your daunger for lending vs any. And yet that alone vvhich vve haue, is not so simple but vve are able vvel to perceiue, vvher the best of your Arguments faileth.

But We are the disconted of Louane. If Louane it selfe be contented vvith vs, the Testimony of such an Vniuersitie should be no reproche vnto vs. As again, vvho cā blame any Catholike in all the vvorld for misliking the ꝓcedings of heresy?

It vvil be said we are fugitiues. VVe are not of that kinde, of the vvhich it is vvrytten, Fugit nemine persequente, he fleeth When no man pursueth him. Prou. 28

Again, vve are not fled so far yet as Geneua is. Nor fled in hart or behauiour from the Catholike Faith of all christendome, Or from one heresy vnto an other.

And further it vvil be obiected, we liue in disorder. In dede vve liue not vnder an hed or vvardē,

depriued of our Collegies, vvithout any our fault againſt the Statutes: neither are there here ſuch Offices, Charges, Romes, or Places Vacant, by taking of vvhich the perſons vvhich in England fulfilled the like very vvorshipfully and vertuouſlye, might declare hovv they be able to rule thē ſelues, and alſo to kepe other in Order: yet vve liue vnder the Rule of the holy Commaundementes of God, and the approued Canōs of the Catholike Church, And the lavvdable Cuſtomes or policies of the places where vve remaine.

And further yet, vve ſhall be ſaide **to wryte for corrupte and priuate gaine.**

But vve are not (vve truſt) ſo il frynded that vve neede it, or ſo il diſpoſed that vve minde it. Againe, they vvhich haue forſaken great and ſure liuinges in England, of one, tvvo, or three hundred pound yerely, they thought not (I beleue) to ſet vp a ſhoppe beyond ſea, and by making of nevv bokes, and ſelling them for x. pence or xij. pence a peece to reare vp both Priuate and Corrupt gaine vnto themſelues.

To be ſhort, **we ſhalbe accompted vnnaturall**, vvhether for ſauing our head, vvhen a blovv is comming at it? Or, for leauing our Cōmodities vtterly? Or chainging of the leſſe for the

the Greater? Or for Louing and Fearing of God more then Man? Some are so kind to their Coũtry, that rather then abide the lack of it, they care not how farre they goe from God. And there haue ben in times past some so faithfull to their Princes, that (whether in Sport or Ernest) they haue said it, he is not worthy of the fauoure of his Prince, that would sticke to go to Hell for his Prince. But he beleued, perchaunse, there was no Hell at all. And so might venter boldlye, where (by his iudgment) there was no daunger. Otherwise if he had so much light of Faithe, as to confesse an Hel, and yet so great blindnesse of Affection, as to loue any Creature so much, that he would cast away his owne soule for euer, he purely was vnnaturall, and his saying is Intolerable.

As for vs, God be mercifull, and geaue vs the Grace to loue him best, nay to loue him without comparison. And after him to loue them best, which come nigheſt vnto him, either by Image of Vertue, or Similitude of Power and Office, euery one yet in his degree and place.

But all these Obiections (I suppose) are Personal, and may be made either of Idle heades for their fantasy, or by Aduersaries, for some Anger, Or of Gentlemen merchantes for their pleasure, or of men right worshipfull, vpon sad reporte made

vnto

vnto them. But yet, vvhat is any of these vnto the question: whether in the six hundred yeares after Christ, there wer any Sole Receauing, or Receiuing vnder both kinds: And so furth in any other of the Challengers Articles? nothing at all vndoubtedly. For be they true, be they false, (because vve vvil not spend much time about it,) they concerne priuate mennes Conditions, and not the Catholike Religion. And they are (as it vvere) a spotted Cote vpon a Reasonable mannes backe, but they proue not, that he hath no Reason at all vvhich vveareth the Cote. Vvherfore it becometh not vs so basely to thinke of their iudgements that consider of our Bokes, that because of the Authors small fauor, the boke it selfe should be out of fauor, or because the person is Condemned, that immediatly the Boke is answvered.

Some cause therfore vndoubtedly there is, in the Bokes themselues, for vvhich they are misliked? But vvhat is that? Is it for the Vntruthes sake vvhich are conteined in them? Is it for the Wreasting and Racking of the Scriptures? Is it for misalleging, misconstrueing, corrupting, or altering the holy Fathers &c. These thinges in deede are directly obiected, to D. Harding, by M. Iewel, but (I trovv) the Serche is not therefore apoynted, that no Answver should come in against them.

Iewel in his Preface to the Reader.

them? Yet except this only be the cause, vvherfore els is the bringing in of them so daungerous?

Is there any thing in them, against the Obedience and Fidelitie due to a Soueraigne? Is there any one blast in them against the Gouernment of vvomen? Do they moue the Comons to take vveapons against the Nobilitie? Or doe they instruct the Nobilitie hovv to let the Commons of their libertie? In one vvord to speake it, doe vve meddle vvith the proper maters of VVeastminster Haule, / Parleament house / or Cyuile Policie, and not only intreat of Articles proponed in Scholes, / meete for Conuocations, and Generall to all Christendome? Take (for exãple) any one, vvhat so euer you vvil, of the Articles proponed by M. Ievvel. He denyeth: vve affirme. / He contrarieth vs: vve againe resist him. Before any man encountred vvith hym, he Raigned in peace and vvas Magnified. It vvas thought, no man vvas euer hable to matche him, and therefore for very despair of any succour, many submitted them selues vnto him. But novve, sense there haue ben found, vvhich haue met vvith him, it is perceaued that he had no certaine victorye. And if it seemed so before, yet novve the battle beginning a freshe, there is stirred vp a closer attention in euery mannes minde, to marke hovv truely it is fought.

And

And in marking diligently, he is nowe, and then found to be iustly noted of Hypocrisy, Foly, Heresy, and other faultes. Now they which read not the Bokes can not marke so muche. Yet they also, of others that haue readen and considered, may lerne. It cummeth then at length to the knowledge of many. And, the very nature of Truthe or dispositions of men so geuing it, many are confirmed, many are warned, many are troubled, euery one is moued. Some see it manifestly, M. Iewel is cōfuted, other looke not so narowly but say, I will better thinke of these matters, Other be lothe to chainge their opinion, and are grieued to heare of ought sayed against him: So that somewhat is wrought, I think, in euery man, one way or other about these matters.

This by likelihode then, is the Sedition, which our Bokes are said to moue. They confirme some in the Truthe, that they be not lightly remoued from it: They direct other vnto the Truthe, that they pretend not lacke of Instruction: they confounde and confute other by the Truthe, that they may take lesse pride in their Chiualry: and they sturre vp a General attention, to marke on whose side the Truthe shall stand, and who shall most Faithfully behaue himselfe in the mater.

Are the Authors then of this maner of Sedition, to be punished? Or the bokes, by vvhich Lies, Deceiptes, and Hereſies be detected, are they to be condemned? If Proteſtantes may be ſuffered, to vvryte as largely as they vvill, ſhall they be permitted alſo to vvryte as falſely as they vvill? Or if no Priuilege, be it neuer ſo Speciall, doth licenſe them to print any Slaunders or Lies, yet if afterwardes they be found out, and marked in theyr Bokes, may no man freely tell them of it, but he ſhall incurre the daunger of the Lavv, and further diſpleaſure? Surely this caſe is very hard, to call firſt into Queſtion, thoſe Truthes of vvhiche the Catholike Church vvoulde haue no doubt feared: And then, to graunt the Proteſtãt ſuch fauour, that he might allvvaies denye and ſtill driue the Catholike to proue, And further (as longe as the Catholike made a ſtay of yelding ſo much to his Aduerſary) to drayv that to an Argument of a vveake cauſe and a faint hart, and to incline to the nevve Goſpellers ſide: And novv laſt of all, (vvhen the Catholikes anſvver them, and ſo anſvver, that they make the other, euery day more and more to be taken in their craft and hereſy) novv, (I ſay) to forbid the Catholikes to Anſvver for themſelues, Or to ſpeake any more againſt ſuch faultes as they finde, this ſurely is a caſe very ſtrainge and hard: So hard vndoubtedly, that vvhat to anſvver vnto it vve can

not tell.

For if our Aduerſaries vvill haue the matter tried by Lerning, our Diuinitie (the end ſhall declare it) is much truer than theirs: but if they vvill novve defend themſelues by force of Authoritye, One extraordinary Argument made by a nevve and freshe Sercher, ſhall more diſſvvade, then a vvhole shiplode of our Bokes can moue, vvhen the reading of them is taken avvay.

But is it not poſsible, to finde fauoure in his ſight, vvhich hath the Ordering of theſe matters committed vnto him? Yeas verely poſsible inoughe, if the Suer for it be notus Pontifici, *and fauored of the Superintendents? Louanians then muſt holde their peace, but the Apology of England (I trovv) may be heard. VVhy: vvhat ſayeth it? Mary,* for men to be careleſſe what is ſpokē by them and their owne mater &c. is the part doubtleſſe of diſſolute and Rechleſſe perſons, and of them which wickedly winke at the Iniuries done vnto the name of God. Againe. Al Lawes and Natures owne voyce, doe commaund vs to defend our owne Cauſe and Innocencye. Againe. The Auncient Chriſtians. &c. put vp Supplications, and made meanes to Emperours and Princes, that they might defend themſelues and their felowes in open Audience.

The Apology of England.

Loe,

Loe, hovv vvell the makers of that Apology could ſpeake for themſelues, and hovv vvell it ſerueth our purpoſe at this preſent? Yet the Oddes is exceding great. For the Catholikes hauing continued time out of minde, in a conſent and certaintye of theyr Faith, might vvell take order, that no man at all ſhould be ſuffered to ſpeake againſte thoſe thinges vvhich vvere ſo generally receiued and alovved: but theſe men vvhich bring a nevv and vpſtart Religion into the vvorld, neither commending it by Authority of any their Predeceſſours, nor concluding it by Reaſon, nor Confirming it by Miracle, hovv ſhoulde they forbid a man to conſider and vevv their Opinions, and require him firſt to build vpon them, before he ſee the ſure ground of them?

If therefore vnto them it be an vnlavvfull and vnnaturall mater, that it ſhould be denied to any man to defend his ovvne cauſe, it ſeemeth that vve may vvel be ſuffered to make our Anſvvers vnto our Aduerſaries: And it ſeemeth allſo, that thoſe maye Read our Anſvvers, vvhoſe loſſe and perill it vvil be, to be kept, by any meanes, avvay from the hearing of the cauſe examined.

But perchaunſe they vvil not be knovven vvhich made the Apologye: and cumming out vvithout a Priuilege, vvho can tell vvhether it be of anye Authority? Eſpecially D. Harding hauing anſvvered

it, and confounding the great boaſt and crakes ſet vpon it.

VVoat ſay vve then to M. Ievvel himſelfe? might not he be intreted, to ſpeak in his beſt maner, for vs? Of the Readineſſe of his good vvill, vve haue already a Teſtymonie. For vnto D. Cole alleaging a Recogniſance, vvhich ſo bound him in, that he vvas not at liberty to diſpute and reaſon vvith him, I would wishe *(ſayeth he)* the Quenes Maieſty would not onlye ſet you at libertie, but alſo commaund you to shew your grounde. *Byſides this, he hath ſo required, ſo deſired, ſo prouoked, ſo erneſtly ſued vnto the Catholikes, to haue their Anſvver vnto his Articles, that if it ſhould novv ſtande vvith his good vvill and Conſcience, yet it agreeth not vvith his honor and vvorthineſſe, to ſee in hys life time ſuch bokes, as to the vvryting of vvhich his prouoking, gaue a neceſſary occaſion, to be ſo condēned, that they ſhoulde neuer be examined or Anſvvered.*

Iew. in the ſecond anſwer to D. Cole.

To you therefore M. Ievvel I ſpeake it, as in this caſe one of the Indifferent Readers. VVhy prouoke ye vs to vvryte? VVhy conſent you to this policye of forbidding our bokes, that vve ſhould not vvryte? VVhy ſuffer ye not the Trueth to haue her ful courſe? VVhy conſtraine you them by feare, vvhome ye ſhuld better perſvvade by lerning? VVhy foreſee you not

that except our bokes be ſuffered to be Readen, you ſhalbe iudged to be afraid, or ouercummed? VVhy Conſider you not politikely, that except the Papiſtes doe keepe you occupied, you vvill fall to greater battels betvvene your ſelues, and vtterly deſye one the other? You ſaid in the Preface of your Reply: Bleſſed be the name of God that hathe offered this Occaſion. For I haue no doubt, but of this neceſſary conflicte, through his mercy, there ſhall iſſue ſome ſparkle to the Glory of his name. *VVhy ſuffer you then the mater of Gods glory and your victory, to be taken avvaye? VVhy pretend you, as though you vvere ſure of vvinning and glad of the Occaſion, by vvhich your goſpel, the more it is impugned and ſtandeth, the more it is glorified, and yet heare of the prohibition of oure Bokes, and haſt not to ſay againſt it? If you had not challenged the Catholikes, the caſe had bene more tolerable, but novv it can neuer ſtand vvith your, or your Religions honeſty, not to defende your ſelfe but by terrour.*

But (to returne againe vnto the Indifferēt Reader) let our ſayinges, if they come properly and directly from vs, be ſtraitvvaies condemned: Let no Reaſon and Argument be good for vs, thoughe the very ſame in our Aduerſaries caſe, muſt be admitted vvho ſo euer ſay nay: And let M. Ievvel forget

his

his old Charitye, and vvishe novve, that vve might be conſtrained to holde our handes and tongues, vvhich vvished before, that vve should be conſtrained to vvryte and Speake: Let all theſe Iniuries be patiently ſuffered: Yet vvho can let vs to vvishe thee vvell, and tel thee of thy Soules daunger vvhen Hereſy is flattering vvith thee: And note the very places vnto thee, in vvhich her lying Sprite is couered, And be glad to haue thinges for thee in a Readineſſe, if the vvinde should happely turne, to ſende them in to thee? Novv if this be an vnnaturall or Seditious minde, haue me excuſed I pray thee, I neuer thought it ſo, nor feared, it vvould ſo be taken. And I can not promiſe ſuch Obedience, or vvarrant to my ſelfe ſuch perfection, that if a Rebell and Aduerſary againſt God and his Church should openlye blaſpheme and deceaue, I vvould not ſpeake againſt him, and trouble his procedinges vvith my Obiections. Yet, if, as many other myſteries, vnheard of before, be reueled in theſe daies, ſo it should likevviſe novv be brought vnto light, that allthough a Theefe vvere eſpied to doe his feate in any houſe, no man for all that should cry out againſt him, for fear of troubling them in the houſe, vvhich are at their bokes, at their meat, at their game, at their reſt, or anye ſuch like: then truely as vve might be ſo aſtonied at this ſtrainge Reuelation, that for a time vve coulde

not

not ſpeake, yet neuertheleſſe (I truſt) vve shoulde turne vnto God and pray. And ſo in like manner, vvhen that is perceaued and confeſſed that in no kinde of caſe, any more may be vvryten againſt M. Ievvel, then shal vve pray God, as he hath vvrought by our ſpeaking, ſo that he vvill continue and vvork by our ſilence. And as the ſilence of the Catholikes vvhen they vvere excedingly prouoked to ſpeake, did more harme perchaunſe then al the other argumẽts of the Heretikes, ſo the letting of the Catholikes to ſpeake, vvhereas through the importunitie of the Aduerſary, they haue bene moued therevnto, shal by Gods Grace, more ſenſibly make others to conſider vvhat Faith they haue forſaken, and vvhat opinions they folovv, then if our Bokes should freely come in and be Readen. Amen. Fare vvel, Reader, and be Indifferent. At Antvverpe the. 10. of May.

REgiæ Maiestatis Priuilegio permissum est Ioanni Rastello Anglo, vt librum inscriptũ, A Treatise intitled, BEWARE OF M. IEWEL, Typis mandare, ac impunè distrahere liceat. Datum Bruxellis. 8. Martij. Anno Domini. 1565.

Subsig.

De la Torre.

Opus istud perlectum est & approbatum à Viris Anglici Idiomatis & sacræ Theologiæ peritissimis, quibus tutô hac in re credendum esse iudico. Idcirco operæpretium fore censeo, vt imprimatur.

Ità testor Cunerus Petri, Pastor S. Petri. Louanij. 7. Martij. 1565.



THE question of the fyrſte article, is: Whether anye priuate Maſſe were in the whole world, for the ſpace of ſixe hundred yeres after Chriſte.

What call we priuate Maſſe? A priuate Maſſe (ſay the Catholikes) is that, which is not ſolemne. And other beſide this, of that name, they haue none.

But what meane ye Heretiks by it? Mary, whereas the prieſt receiueth the Sacramente him ſelf alone, that we call (ſayth M. Iewel) priuate Maſſe, yea allthoughe the whole pariſhe be preſent. Ergo, this terme ſo taken, is not in the proper bokes & ſcholes of Catholikes, but is alltogether of the deuiſe of Proteſtantes. Ie. pa. 4.

To what ende is the mouinge of this queſtion aboute priuate Maſſe? Or what hath any Diuine to doe with it? The concluſion is, that if it can be proued, M. Iewell is content to yeld and ſubſcribe.

But what if it can not be proued? Forſoothe then is M. Iewel, I trowe, a true man of his worde. Is this all? And hath this great fighting, and writinge on bothe

hydes no further end, but to the commendation or dispraise of one man, and hym not so wonderfull? No truly, it is not for the lerned or studiouse so to doe, suche specially as haue, or take charge of religion, but rather to direct all theyr oppositions and answers vnto that end, by whiche somewhat may be concluded, either duly, to the honor of God, or profitably, to the defense of the Church.

Haue both sydes then, done so for theyr part? That now is to be considered. First concerninge the Catholike, he goeth directly to some purpose, and bringeth the question vnto that state, in whiche the aduersarie is so answered, that the Churche also is defended. The Protestant, he, at the beginninge seemed also to meane playnlye, but nowe, he hath brought the question vnto suche pointes, as by whiche neither his aduersarie is any thinge hurted, nor the Churche, whiche he impugnethe, any thinge touched.

By whiche it appeareth, the one to haue labored to some end, the other to haue craked to no purpose.

As in example: D Harding conceyueth the matter thus:

If

If priuate Masse, in respect only of that it is priuate, after your meaning, be reproueable: it is for ỹ single Communion, that is to say, for ỹ the Priest receiueth the Sacrament alone, Maior. Hard. 39

But the single Communion is lawfull, yea good and godly: Minor.

Ergo the priuate Masse, in this respecte, that it is priuate, is not reproueable. Conclu.

It followeth then, that Christes institution is not broken, when the Priest receiueth alone: And consequently, the Catholike Churche is not to be condemned, for allowing that manner of receiuyng. The Catholike reasoneth to some purpose.

Thus hath D. Harding, and euery other Catholike, learned to referre his reasoning to some purpose, that others may be edified by it.

But nowe on the other side, what say you, M. Iewel, to the matter? what importe you wyth all your preparaunce? whome prouoke you? what cõclusion seke you?

ou: You aſke a queſtion of priuate Maſſe, whether any ſuche were, ſix hundred yeres after Chriſt. A ſtraunge queſtion vnto Catholikes, and therfore you muſte expounde your meaning vnto vs.

Ie. pa. 59 1. I demaund (ſay you) of the open Church 2. I demaund of Prieſtes. 3. I demaunde of the Maſſe. 4. I demaund of the right vſe of the holy ſupper that ought to ſtand. 5. I demaund of the vſage that thē was ordinary.

Fiue greate demaundes, and ſomewhat terrible vnto the vnſkilful, as a viſarde vnto a childe, that can not iudge what is within it.

M. Iewels greate a doe about nothyng. But marke, good Reader, how litle he ſhal make of them. Let me graunt vnto you, M. Iewel, that I can not proue any prieſt, to haue SAIDE MASSE, ORDINARILY, in OPEN CHVRCH, and to haue receiued alone. what inferre you herevpon? Or how doth this further your procedings, or diſproue the preſent doings of the Catholike Church? This ſure is an idle queſtion, which maketh ſo much a doe about that, which the contrary ſyde maye graunt without any preiudice to the cauſe.

1. For concerning the firſt: Chriſtes inſtitution may be fulfilled in priuate houſes.

The

The second: women, boyes, and lay mē, are christen soules, and proue, that Christes institution is not broken, if they be allowed to receiue alone. 2.

As for the third: I answer, that your questiō was not of Masse, but of priuate Masse. And if you wil make the question of Masse, tell vs of it, and you shall be prouided for. 3.

To the fifth: that which may be but once done well, needeth not many repetitions of the same, to proue that it is lawfull. 5

Only now therfore, the fourth demaund doth remaine to be discussed, which is of the right vse of ỹ holy supper. To which our answer is, that he vseth it rightlye, which receiueth it with faithe, hope, and charitye. But as for receiuing alone, or with companye, the Catholike Church acknowledgeth her selfe to be therin at liberty, to vse either the one, or the other manner. Upon this question (whiche in deede is the proper of your firste article) if you dare openlye encounter with vs, then are you come to the same state of controuersy, to whiche all Catholikes haue brought it. Neither can you complain that he swarueth from that he hath taken in hand. But if ye will not reason about sole receiuing, but stande vpon your 4. Iew. 59.

circumstancies and demaundes nothinge substantiall, then doe I answer, as I did before, that I can not proue priuate Masse after suche solemne maner as you require: that (I meane) it was ORDINARY, and in OPEN CHVRCHES: contenting my selfe with this, that although by euident example, I finde not, it was so, yet by moste necessary principles I can proue that it might haue bene so. And further reioysing in this, that although I do yelde in your demaundes vnto you (the fourthe only excepted, which only is worth the asking, and in which you be sufficiently answered) yet you may not loke, that the Ladies of Israell with their Lutes and Timbrels will receiue you in triumphe, because with all your strokes hitherto, you haue hurted no body.

Your questions therfore, M. Iewel, being altogether so vain and fruteles, ỹ they neither touch vs nor profite you, let vs returne vnto D. Hardinges argument or resolution, to geue therby vnto the indifferent Reader, the true meaning of this first Article: and to put before him, ỹ Catholike belefe of the Church in this matter.

The true state of ỹ question aboute priuate masse

The state of the question, as Catholikes haue

haue conceiued it, is comprehended in this one foresaid argument:

If priuate Masse, in respect only of that it is priuate, be reprouable, it is for the single Communion, Maior.

But single Communion is not reproueable: Minor.

Ergo priuate Masse, in this respecte that it is priuate, is not reproueable. Conclu.

This argument is good, and holdeth of that common rule: A destructione consequentis, ad destructionem antecedētis. That is, to make it plaine, when we make a conditionall or double proposition, the deniall of the former parte, doth well folowe vpon the deniall of the later. As in example: The proofe of the cōsequēce in this argument:

If M. Iewel be a lawfull Bishop, (this is the former parte) *he was duelye consecrated,* (this is the later part. And both these ioyned together do make one Proposition.

Take away now the later part, and ye shall conclude the taking away of ỹ former, as:

But M. Iewel was not duely consecrated:

Ergo he is not a lawfull bishop.

The argument therfore, whiche D. Harding hath proponed, is of a verye good and right making. But what thinketh M. Iewel of it? He frameth it after his owne likinge, and that, which the author himselfe would haue to be Hypothetical, he maketh it altogether Cathegorical, in this sorte:

Here beginneth M. Iewel to worke his feate in alterig thinges to his purpose.

The priuate Masse is single communion. Single communion is lawfull: Ergo priuate Masse is lawfull.

Then dothe he not answer neither this argument, but by another which shallbe folish, & of his owne making, he would haue this to be iudged. As, The ministration of priuate Masse is a single communion, Single communion is lawfull for a woman: Ergo, the ministration of priuate Masse is lawfull for a woman.

No no M. Iewel, you can not goe inuisible. we se well inough how you cast in the terme Ministration, to make a sport, or Absurditie. Of whiche follie or sutteltie you wilbe tolde in due season. But concerning D. Har-

D. Hardings argument, it is an hypothetical Syllogiſmus: and theſe which you make are altogether Cathegorical, ſo that they be of far other kinde and makinge. whiche geaueth me to ſuſpecte, that your wittes were not in their natural place in your hed, when you were ſo much occupied, (as your boke declareth) in conſideration of Medius Terminus, Subiectum, and Prędicatum: leaſt your reader mighte be deceiued by that argument of D. Hardinges, which had neither directe Medius terminus, nor Prędicatum, nor Subiectum, to be feared, as beinge not made in Mode and Figure, but concluded out of that rule or conſequence, A deſtructione conſequentis. &c. Of whych I haue ſpoken. Ie. pa. 99

The forme therefore of D. Hardinges argument being proued good, let vs conſyder the matter and truthe of euery propoſition in it. The Maior is declared after this ſorte.

If priuate Maſſe be not reprouable, in this reſpecte only, that it is priuate and hath ſingle Communion: thē doe you M. Iewel digreſſe from the pur-

The proſe of the maior in the foreſaid argument.

The proofe of the Maior in the foresaid argumẽt.

purpose, and aske more, then one question, at one tyme. But we could not suspecte, that you would iumble with vs so confusely. Ergo it is saied with good reason, that, if priuate Masse be reproueable, it is in this respecte only, that it is priuate and hath single communion.

The forme hereof is good a destructione consequentis &c. as aboue.

The Maior I will declare. For if you will not be bound to rest vppon the terme and sense of priuate, but be at liberty to comprehend within your meaninge, all that is imported in the name of Masse, then may you require of vs, by vertu of this question to make answer vnto you, not only of sole receauinge, but of receiuinge in both kinds, of the seruice in the latine tonge, of the reall presence of Christe in the Sacrament, of the sacrifice, and many other matters bysides. Because all these are included within the compasse of these two wordes Priuate, and Masse. Now to the Minor.

But

But we could not suspecte that ye would so iumble with vs.

For distinct articles being put forth by you, of Communion vnder both kindes, Seruice in the vulgar tonge &c. Ye signifie therby, that ye loke for a seuerall answer vnto eche of them, and that, within the question of priuate Masse, ye intended not to passe the boundes and sense of this worde Priuate. For of Consecration (we may be sure I trust) you moued no question, whether it be proper to the Priest, or whether the people may also doe it. Yet the Masse doth extend it selfe vnto consecration. If therefore, neither we are so suspitious as to feare it, neither you so folish as to say it, that in asking vs a questiō of priuate Masse, ye douted or demaunded, whether ỹ Priest alone doth consecrate and not the people, or, whether one Priest alone may consecrate by hym selfe, without helpe or assemble of other Priestes, (if this one point which properlye pertaineth to the Priestes office and the substance of a Masse) was not respected of you in the question of priuate Masse: you muste needes confesse and yelde, that

that you referred this first article of yours, to some one speciall and singular matter, and that ye extended it not, vnto all questions that might be moued vppon the Masse. And that speciall thinge what it should be, besides sole receiuinge, it was not, nor could not be perceiued: Ergo it is said with good reason, that if the priuate Masse be reproueable, it is for the single communion.

Yet knowing so much as we doe, if all were to begin againe, we would not vse these Ifs and discourses, to finde oute what you did meane by priuate Masse, but we would rather wil you, to procede againste vs in order, and not to couer manye Articles vnder pretence of one question, that in shifting from one to the other, ye myghte seeme to tarye still in one place, by keeping the selfe same termes (priuate Masse) and yet euer skip from one poynte to another, because ye prouide to be at your own proper choise, what one sense of manye, ye will haue to be conceiued by priuate Masse, and, at pleasure, to passe from any one sēse to the other. But who wold haue thought it, that they affected to make confusion, which promised to bring all truthe into or-

der

der and syght? Or that they which pretended to require good proofe for Sole receyuing onlye, woulde afterwardes bynde the answerer to proue the sole receiuynge at MASSE, and then, the SAYING of Masse and after that, the saying of it in OPEN CHVRCH, and yet farther, the ORDINARY saying & receiuing in open Church & (to be shorte) binde him to proue CONSECRATION, OBLATION, ELEVATION, ALTAR, VESTIMENT, or any other thing to the Masse belonging? By which woords we may see how many questions M. Iewel would saye (for a nead) to be comprehended & ment of him in these .ij. woords priuate Masse. D. Harding therfore which knew not so much, or could not suspecte so much (as, ỳ M. Iewel did at one time, and with one breathe, aske of so manye distinct matters in one plaine proposition, without geuing therof any warninge) made that conditionall and Maior proposition, to that his argumēt, of which I haue spoken, which Maior being so reasonable and allowable, I come now to the prouing of the Minor of ỳ same argument, which is this:

M. Iewels large walkes in plain matter, & one direct question.

The minor of D. Hardings argumēt, declared.

Single communion is allowable.

Here

Here, because M. Iewel is contente to be tried, by the examples of the fiue hundred yeres after Christe, and because this kinde of perswasion is most sensible, I wil bring two or three of them, for our purpose.

Eccl. Hist lib. 5. Ca. 24. Har. fo. 52.

The Byshopes of Rome, when any Catholike Byshopes came thither from other countries, vsed to send them the Sacrament to receaue: Ergo single Communion is allowable.

What answereth M. Iewel vnto this? Or how: concludeth he (as it were) in D. Hardinges name?

Iew. p. 41. Behold, in another example. M. Iew. feate.

Ergo (forsooth saieth he) there was Masse, and addeth further: This conclusion is far fet and hangeth losely. For I might demaund whiche of the three saied Masse? He that sent the Sacrament, or he that receaued it, or els the messenger that brought it? It were a straunge matter to see a Masse and yet no man to say Masse. Lo how closely M. Iewel keepeth his wittes together. He is opposed with Single Communion, and he demaundeth of the Masse: the obiection goeth vpon the receauinge the Communion, and he asketh (without answer making) who saied the Masse. But to another example.

Tertul-

Tertullian dehorting his wife from mariyng to an Infidel after his death: will not thy husband know (saieth he of the sacrament) what thou eatest secretly before al other meates. &c. Ergo single Communion is alloweable. Har. fo. 32.

But M. Iewel taketh it not so. how thē? Mary. Ergo Tertullians wife saied priuate Masse. And hereupon then wil ryse a greate dout, whether a woman might say Masse, or no, or who helped her if she saied it. Yet sauing for M. Iewels pleasure, that neaded not, because D. Harding speketh directly not, of saying Masse, but only of receauing the single Communion. Iew. 46. The same feate aganst folowed.

An other example: Serapion lyeng at the point of death, ỹ Priest whom he sent for, being sycke him selfe, sent the sacramēt vnto him and he receaued it and departed. Ergo single Communion is aloweable. Har. fo. 34. Eccl. Hi. lib. 6. Ca. 34.

I pray you M. Iewel, is not this spokē plaine enough? no truly, not to such a wrāgler. For, as though it were to be marked in this story, not, how Serapiō receiued ỹ sacramēt,

but only who brought it vnto him, so secketh M. Iewel for the bringer of it, and finding that it was Serapions boy, to whom the priest deliuered it, he layeth hãdes vpon him and concludeth: Ergo Serapions boy sayed priuate Masse.

All of like vaine sort and of like small honestie.

Thus doth M. Iewel handle D. Harding through the whole first article, either like an hypocrite dissembling it, that we vnderstãd by priuate Masse or single Communion, not the saying and celebratinge of Masse, or Communion, but that onlye act, of whosoeuer it be, which receaueth the Communion alone: either like a dull or distracted person not perceauing it, that all the Argumentes, Examples, and Authorities are, to that only end, referred. But he hath not so litle wit, as not to perceaue whereabout D. Harding went. For, in the answer to the 23. Division, wher D. Harding sheweth in what sense he taketh the question of priuate Masse: he confesseth that D. Harding hath taken paines to proue Sole receauinge, and single Communion that was neuer denyed. And againe. Now he demaundeth whether I reproue the Masse, or the priuate Masse. What meaneth this, that priuate Masse and sole receauing be so sodenly growen in one?

Iewel 56

See

See then, he confesseth that D. Harding doth vnderstand by Priuate Masse, sole receauing. And therfore he misliketh it, sayinge, what Meaneth this &c. And then he laboreth to proue that it must not be his meaninge, and why? forsooth, because:

Surely M. Harding well knoweth that the nature of the wordes is not one. Neither who so euer receaueth alone, doth therefore of necessitie take Priuate Masse. Iew. 57.

True it is, M. Iew. and therfore D. Harding knowing right well ỳ Priuate Masse, might diuersely be taken, & that you would make it to signify the SAYING of Priuat Masse, & he not so, but the Single Cõmunion and Sole Receauing; therfore he warned you of it, that the question might be distinctly handled. you therfore confessinge so much, that he went about to proue Sole Receauinge only and not to medle in this article vb the Masse, either you haue played the very hypocrites part, in pretendinge a talke to the purpose whiche in deede you knew to be otherwise: Either you haue shewed a shamefull and hatefull vilany, in burdeninge a man of good estimation and lerninge with so many, and folish consequences as you attribute vnto hym. And

further you haue abused greate numbers of your Readers moste wickedly, in drawinge theyr soules after you into perdition, by makinge them beleue that you speake as you knowe, your knowledge being contrarie to your vttrance.

For suppose that your meaninge, in the question were, as you saye, and that your demaund was, to be satisfied in all these pointes: whether a Priest did SAIE MASSE, in OPEN CHVRCH, ORDINARILY, and receaue alone, in the sixe hundred yeares after Christe, and that, if any of these Circumstances were leste vnproued, ye woulde not be bound to subscribe, suppose I saye, that this were true, yet seeinge your Aduersarye folowed another sense, ye should haue consydered, if, not hym, yet your selfe, your lerned Counsell, your Secretarye and Scribes, your Prynter, and Reader, and haue made a better answer with lesse coste and labor, declaringe in fewe wordes, howe Doctor Hardinge had mistaken you, and expoundinge in playne wordes, how your owne meaning should be conceaued.

But

But nowe, whereas Doctor Hardinge followed the right sense in decde of the question, and your sense, M. Iewel, thereupon, hath no end or purpose to whiche it serueth: why aske you so importunately for the Masse? why demaund you?

IF here be a Masse, which of the two is it, that sayeth this Masse? Is it the sicke man, or the Priest? Iew. 32.

why trifle you?

That the question is moued not of anye other man or woman, but of the Masse, and only of the Priest that saieth the Masse. 33. The some of M. Iewels answers in this first Article.

why lye you?

M. Harding hath brought forth these Fathers for his Masse.

why wrangle you?

That for lacke of Priestes M. Harding allegeth Tertullians wife, Certaine women out of Cyprian, and Serapions boy, not the fittest persons that might haue bene found to saye Masse. 42 44.

why pitie you hym of your pure cõpassion?

Alas doeth M. Hardinge thinke it was the maner in old tymes, that laye people should saye Masse? 59.

why describe you the matter so cunningly, and saye?

76 M. Hardinge ſhall not finde here any Maſſe ſpoken of at all, neither bread nor wine, nor Conſecration, nor Oblation, nor Eleuation, nor Altar, nor Veſtiment, nor any thing to the Maſſe belonginge? And to be ſhort, (D. Harding intendinge to ſpeake not of the Maſſe, or ſayinge of it, but only of ſole receauing) why triumph you & why crake you, that The Maſſe which we muſt neades
91 beleue, is ſo Auncient, ſo vniuerſal, ſo Catholike, ſo holy, ſo Glorioufe, cá not be foũd neither in Churches nor Chappels, nor in ſecret Oratories, nor in Priuate howſes, in Towne or Citie, but muſt be ſought out in ſome Petie pariſh in the coũtrie, and that by coniecture only.

To this effect then, cometh the firſt article. M. Iewel dalieth ſtil, ẏ D. Harding ſheweth not any Priuate Maſſe, that is (by his interpretatiõ) where any Prieſt SAID maſſe, ORDINARILI, in OPEN CHVRCH and receaued alone: D. Harding proueth Priuate Maſſe, that is to ſay, ſingle Communion, or Sole receauing.

Of M. Iewels meaning, no purpoſe foloweth.

For whẽ it is graunted, for example that we are not able to proue againſt him (with all

all those Circumstances) what is his cause the better for it? Of D. Hardinges conclusion this commoditie groweth, that sole receauing is allowable by the example and Testimonies of the Primatiue Church.

Ergo it standeth well with Christes institution. Frome henceforth therefore, let no Heretike craike of Christs institution, as though that could not admit Sole receauing. So shall the Church haue some peace, and the Catholikes be quieted in this sure truth, that Sole Receauing is not against Christes institution.

This ground now and verity standing, let M. Iewel (if he dare) come visible furth, and shew an open face and intent, without all dubling. And then shall it be playnly perceaued, whether he must yelde and subscribe or no. Here for example are six questions.

whether a sicke mã hauing no penance to fulfill, may receaue alone at his departing. 1

whether a sicke man whiche is not yet reconciled, but tarieth in his penance, may receaue alone at the point of his death. 2

whether a sicke man being not in daunger of death may receaue alone. 3

whether a man in good health and good 4

lyfe may receaue alone.

5. whether a Priest not celebrating, may receaue alone.

6. whether a Priest at Masse, may receaue alone.

Betwixt these sixe, eche of them towardes an other, there is some differences, and therefore they make two seueral questions.

The truth which is confessed on both sides, is:

That Christes institution doth stand with Sole Receauing in generall.

For he which is put from the Communion, and lyeth at the pointe of death maye receaue alone, euen by Master Iewels confession: which yet is impossible to be true, if Sole Receauing were absolutely againste Christes Institution.

Therefore, in what other speciall kinde of Sole Receauing his Institution is violated, therein muste, of right, be the question. And therein let M. Iewel ioyne, (if he thinke hym selfe able) with the Catholike.

As, whether a sicke man beinge not put from the Communion for some faulte of his

his, maye at the pointe of death receaue alone or no, and so furth, in any of the six foreſayed queſtions.

Now when it ſhall be put furth in one ſpeciall caſe, if he ſhall then fetche his vagaries about, and run ouer his Common places, That Chriſtes Inſtitution is to be obſerued, That the Primitiue Church had a Communion, and proue it by ſundrie wais, Out of holy Fathers, Out of M. Hardinges owne Doctors (as he will terme them) and Out of the very Maſſe boke it ſelfe. &c Let it be vnderſtanded, that if he ſpeake ſo in generall, and applieth it not to the ſpeciall caſe proponed, he falleth within daunger of his owne ſentence. Vanitas vanitatum. And, that it is a greate token of idleneſſe, to bee earneſt and copious in prouynge that thinge, that no man denieth. Iew. 16

Againe, It is a lewed kinde of Logike, ſtoutely to proue that thinge, that needeth no proſe, & to leaue the thing that ſhould be proued.

On the other ſyde, if he wyll deale ſincerelye and vprightely in deede, and, leaue to vſe ſuche feates as he hath in this

his first Replie practised, then shal it quickly be perceiued, that either he must yeld and subscribe, or els craue a licence to be loosed frome ẏ bond, into which he cast hym selfe, through his own hastines, in his Challẽge.

The second Article.

(***)

IN this second Article, the question is, whether there was then (vnderstãd six hundred yeres after Christ) any Cõmunion ministred vnto ẏ people vnder one kynd.

96

Is this al? It seemeth to be al, because in the vttering of the Challenge, there is no other forme of wordes concerning this question. Yet least perchance we shall be handeled here, as we haue bene in the first Article, let vs aske M. Iewel what he intendeth and what he demaundeth in this question.

Syr, and please you, what if we proue vnto you, that some haue receaued the Sacrament vnder one kind at home in theyr owne

owne houses as Serapion did: is not the question concluded against you? No saieth M. Iewel. The question is of the vsage and order of the CHVRCH. M. Hardinges answer is of Serapions death bed, as though there had bene no CHVRCH yet erected in those daies. Ecc. hist. lib. 6. ca. 34. Iew. 13. The first shift of M. Iew.

Yes verely there were, but as we maye say with S. Hierome: Christ is not one at home in the house, an other in the Church, and that which is not contrary to Christes institution and commaundement, maye be done without the Church, of building which, he gaue no commaundement. But let vs go further. In Apologia aduersus Iouin.

If I may proue vnto you, that some certaine persons as sicke men and faintye, haue receiued vnder one kind: shall that stand vs in any stead against you? No sayeth M. Iewel. This is the only thing that I denied, that ye are not able to bring anye one sufficient example, or authority, that euer the WHOLE PEOPLE receiued the Communion in open Church vnder one kinde. Surely you be an hard man to deale withall, which will measure your witnesses by quantity, and not by quality, and seke there, for a number, where a fewe Iew. 13. The second shift.

and

and honest examples were to be credited.

Well, I will not yet leaue you so. What if I can proue that receiuing vnder one kind, was to be found in close Chappels and Oratories, in wildernesse and Caues, whyther contempt of the world, or anoydinge of persecution draue the Christians: go we not directly vnto the question, and bring you into necessity of subscribing and yelding? No sayeth Maister Iewel againe.

The third Shifte. Iew. 96. The question that standeth betwene vs, is moued thus, WHETHER THE HOLY COMMVNION. &c. were euer ministred OPENLY in the Church. Yet he lieth, for neither OPENLYE, neither CHVRCHE is specifyed in the question.

How say ye to infantes, if I proue that they in old time receiued in one kind, OPENLY, and in the CHVRCH, doth not this make against you? No sayeth Maister Iewel. Maister Harding maketh his whole plea vpon an infant, and yet of infantes as he knoweth I spake nothing. Iew. 139. No more did ye of OPEN CHVRCH, WHOLE

The fifth Shifte.

WHOLE PEOPLE, LAY MEN, Prieſtes or others: But ye made an vniuerſal and indefinite negatiue propoſition, which is by all reaſon ſufficiently reproued, if but in one particular, the contraye be proued.

But let vs conſider the compaſſe of your inuention a litle further. What if we proue that the two Diſciples whom Chriſt ouertoke in the way to Emaus, receiued the Sacrament vnder one kind? Or that S. Ambroſe and S. Baſile receiued likewiſe vnder one? is not all this plaine contrary to your aſſertions? No ſayeth M. Iewel.

For the queſtion is moued of LAY PEOPLE. M. Harding bringeth examples of Chriſt and two diſciples, who were of the number of Seuenty and two, and therfore it maye well be thought they were miniſters and not of the lay ſort. Iew. 126, The fifth Schiſme.

And againe:

I demaunde of the layitie, he aunſwereth of Sainct Ambroſe and Sainct Baſile whiche were Bishoppes.

In dede M. Iewel you muſte pardon him, for hee thoughte that a good argumente for Communion vnder one kinde

might haue ben taken of Christ & his two disciples, or of S. Ambrose, or S. Basils authority alone. But seing you haue now so conueighed the matter, that all that will not serue, where might a man finde examples to please you? If it were by one example to be shewed that the laitye and WHOLE PEOPLE receiued OPENLY vnder one kinde, and in the CHVRCH, would this satisfie you? No not this. For the thing denied by M. Iewel, is this, That the Sacrament was euer ministred vnto the people in one kind openly in any congregation, or in the OPEN ORDER and vsage of any CHVRCH

The sixth shifte. Iew. 143.

And againe: It will not folowe that this was the COMMON ORDER of the Church. By which wordes ORDER, and VSAGE, we see one or two euidences would not be taken, because so few proue not an VSAGE.

Iew. 133.

How now then? when will this felow leaue his flying backe? You should (M. Iewel) come nearer and nearer, or stay at the least in some Conclusion. But ye adde still more and more to the question, and seeke to come out of the straits, into which through folish hardinesse you are cast by your

your owne glorious Sermon. Surely ye be gone a great way, from those plaine and few wordes, which, this question of Communion vnder both kindes, had at the beginning. Yet will I folowe you, if perchaunce I may see some end.

Therfore if I were able to proue, that the WHOLE PEOPLE (without mentioning of Bishops, Priestes, or Infants) did receiue vnder one kind OPENLY, in any CONGREGATION, or in the OPEN ORDER and VSAGE of any Church: Then I trust, you would geue ouer all contention. No, you will neuer leaue till you haue brought it to an endlesse controuersye. The Negatiue of our side, (say you) which so much troubleth him is this. That for the space of six hundred yeares after Christ, it can not be found in any old Doctor or Councell, that euer the holy Communion was ministred to the people, in the Church, or in any open assemble, in one kinde only, AS IT IS NOWE MINISRED IN THE CHVRCH OF ROME. You be safe M. Iewel, I warrant you, you be safe. All the Catholikes in the whole world, are not able to take you. For what exceptions

Iew. 142 The. ou. shal.

wyl

will not you make, and what Extensions will not you deuise, vnder pretense of these wordes: AS IT IS NOW MINISTRED IN THE CHVRCH OF ROME. Come who will, let him bring what he can: If from the Priestes crowne downe to his foote: And from Confiteor to Ite Missa est, he proue not the like to haue beene vsed then, as is nowe: in Amice, Albe, Stole, Girdle, Praying, Blessing, Eleuating, Breaking, Communicating and distributing. &c. who shall let M. Iewel to say, that he demaunded of such order of ministring, as is now in the Church of Rome: For as well he may in this matter of Receiuing vnder both kindes, make question of the Priestes vestmentes, and of his soft speaking: as in the question of Priuate Masse, which concerneth nothinge else but Sole Receiuinge, draw the state of it vnto saying of Masse, and thereupon shewe many feates of his Chiualry. And when shall he then come to the poynt of the controuersye, whiche hath chosen such compasses to wander about in? Therefore M. Iewel if you hold your selfe here, you be safe enough I warrant you.

Lut

But are ye not ashamed so to trifle, and to fight for nothing with suche contention? We can not proue against you so formallye and demonstratiuelye as you require, neither can we answer your challenge as nowe you haue expressed it. But what then? where is the profit of youre victorye? what spoiles bring ye to your companye?

This is your fault Maister Iewell, as in the former Article, so now againe in this, that you make a mightie shew, and are not hable to fasten one blowe, you laboure with hande and tounge, as thoughe you woulde conquere some, and free passage beinge graunted you, ye can take nothinge away from vs. The vain contention of M. Iewel.

For let not the receauing vnder both kindes be feũ in, OPEN CHVRCH, and, VSAGE OF THE CHVRCH, and, in the WHOLE PEOPLE, And, AS IT IS NOWE MINISTRED IN THE CHVRCHE OF ROME: Yet for so muche as by Christe and his two Disciples, by Saincte Ambrose, Serapion and others, we proue that it is not contrarie to

his Institution, we confound your lying rouge, which speaketh so lowdely and carnestly thereof, as though the Catholike Church did not kepe it, because the Laicitie now, receaueth vnder one kynd in moste places.

If it be true (as your selfe confesse either voluntarely or constrained by the Catholikes) that Receauing vnder one kind, hath Examples for it in the Primitiue Churche, and those yeres which you were content to be tried by, then is it aloweable. And then surely, it is not against Christes Institution. And then, doth the vse of the Church now, stand with Christes Institution: and then shuld not you so shamefully abuse your Aduersarie, with how can M. Harding warrant the manifeste breach, of Christes INSTITVTION? Againe: The causes that moueth the Church of Rome to break Christes INSTITVTION are not great. Againe: M. Harding, thus maintaining the open abuse of the holy mysteries offendeth against Christes INSTITVTION. Again: what? troweth he there is no difference betwene obeing Gods COMMAVNDEMENT, and breaking gods COMMAVNDEMENT? Againe: with

The Catholike hathe his purpose.

Iew. 119

343

150

119

With what indifferent iudgement then can M. Harding thus compare these thinges together, an INSTITVTION with no INSTITVTION? Againe, the best stay that these mẽ cã lay hold vpõ, is to deny Christes INSTITVTION. Again, M. Harding thinketh that the people may safely breake Christes INSTITVTION &c: As though either he, or any other Catholik wẽt about it. But if it be so in deede, and if you will abyde by it, that Christes Institution is broken, when any receaueth vnder one kinde alone: goe not then from that state of the question. and before this be tried, trouble not vs, and others with matters impertinent. 116

Wherefore did you mone this question, whether within six hundred yeares after Christ, any Communion was ministred vnto the people vnder one kind; did ye it not to this end, that you might conclude there vpon. (if no man would aunswer you) that Christes Institution is now broken of the Catholikes, which minister otherwise then they did in the Primitiue Churche? Ergo, the marke which you loke vnto, is Christes Institution: which to proue to be with vs, or against vs, we therefore consider the doinges of the Primitiue Church. 114

D i. And 110

And because exãples are foũd enẽ in ẏ age, & such records, as your self dare not yet deny, by which we know, ẏ receauing vnder one kind was many times vsed: we cõclude in ẏ principal, ẏ it is not against Christes Institution to receaue vnder one kinde. Do you deni ẏ cõsequẽt? How cã you, which haue so appeled to the primitiue Church, as though you wold be cõtẽt & quiet, if good testimonies of that time could be alleged against you? what say ye thẽ to ẏ Antecedẽt? ye cõfesse it in plain words ẏ some receaued then vnder one kind, saying: Neither did I deny that euer any one mã receued the Cõmuniõ in one kind. But yet (you reply) it was an abuse. I here you wel. But that is another question. And it is another shift also, much fouler thẽ any of the forenamed. Remember your self M. Iewel, I pray you, and let vs conclude our matters in order.

Iew. 132.

The. viij. shift.

The first question should haue bene: VVhether Christes Institution doth stand with receauing vnder one kinde.

The first vs you, but the second rather vs vs, is: whether any Communion was then ministred vnto the people vnder one kinde. We proue, & you cõfesse ẏ some hath ben ministred. Ergo it is time ye yeld & subscribe.

A

A iij. question now, & if you wil, shal be: whether it were an abuse in ỹ primitiue Church to receue vnder one kind.

And so furth in many other, according to the circumstancies of Persons, time, and places. But before we come to thē, do you in the meane time as you promised: for we haue proued ỹ which you denied. If you striue, & say ye mēt ỹ it was not OPENLY receiued vnder both kinds, & ORDINARI ly: Thā what a trifler or wrāgler be you, to chalēge vs about circūstāces, before we wer agreed vpō ỹ substāce of ỹ mater. yet if you wil nedes haue OPENLY ỹ his felowes put in, thē begin again, & speak more plain ly. for as ye haue proponed ỹ mater, ye are ouercōme. And yet before ye begin ỹ chose circūstāces, I warn you, it wil be to no purpose, because our selues may confesse vnto you, ỹ we cā not gaine say it: & you shal cōclude nothing against vs, by it. For ỹ churches cause is sufficiētly defēded, if receiuing vnder one kind may be proued, by any aūcient exāple, wbout any exception made by you. Thus it may be againe sene, how M. Iew. speaketh, in all this second Article, to no purpose, if he make the question so circumstantiall, as he hath labored to haue it.

Either perde or take better hold fast, and begin agains.

On the other syde, the Catholike cause is sufficientlye defended, both by our owne witnesses, and by confession of our Aduersaries, because it is proued sundry wayes, that receaning vnder one kind was knowen and vsed in the Primitiue Churche, and therefore vndoubtedly it is not repugnant to Christes Institution.

The third Article.

(***)

COncerning this question of the Common Prayers, whether in the sixe hundred yeres after Christ, they were in a strange tonge which the People did not vnderstand: what can any Catholik of these partes of the world say more, then that they were in the Greeke tounge or Latine tounge only? For whereas neither Authoritye of Scripture cõmaundeth it, neither veritie of Tradition confirmeth it, neither report of Historie witnesseth it, neither yet any Token or Memorie signifieth it, that the Publike Seruice of the Churche Easte or weaste, was within the compasse of the first six hundred yeres, in any

any other tounge then Greeke or Latine: what lightnesse muste it be, to forsake the orders which we haue, and take others, I can not tell what?

1. Cor. 14.

The Apostle maketh an expresse distinction betwene the Idiote and him that supplieth the place. Of the Idiote (concerning the Common Prayers) he geueth no precept, of the other he sayeth, how shall he, that supplieth the place of the Idiote, answer Amen, vpon thy blessing? Now by Tradition, we haue receaued no other, but Latine or Greeke Seruice. Of the change of the vulgar tongue, into any of these two, Greek or Latin, or of setting vp of these, in stede of the knowen and vulgar tounge, there is no mention in any writer. And laste of al, ther can be shewed no token or sufficient similitude, that the Seruice of old tyme, was in the vulgar tounge. Ergo how should a reasonable man condemne that whiche hym selfe seeth so generally vsed, and folowe another vnknowē manner, to which he is vncertainely referred?

1 It is no wisedome to chaūge that we haue, for an other thing, no mā is sure what.

2

3

4

S. Augustine saieth it but of Ceremonies, that, If the whole Church throughout the world, doe obserue any thing: to dispute thereof it is a point of most insolent madnes.

August. ad Ianuar. ep. 118.

And if it be so in ceremonies, is it not much more so in publike Seruice? For in Ceremonies (because of indifferencie of thē in them selues, and infirmity of some persōs, which be ouer curiouse against them) manie poyntes might be reasoned vpon, and (If manifest neede require) be omitted. Yet, If the whole Church vse them, there ought to be no question. But in publike Seruice, which perteyneth to the state of the Church, and in which, the mouing of any dout causeth the whole Religion to be shaken: how is it to be suffered, that she should be apposed? Or that any priuate persons without reason or authority, should cal that into question, which is generally receaued?

The Heretikes of this age say, that the Latine Seruice (for example) in all the west Churche, hathe not come frome the six hundred yeres after Christe. Frome whence came it then? who were the planters of it? who were the mainteyners? If they did it w consent of al the weast Cōtries, that is a great preiudice against youre contentionsnesse. If they did it by force or violence, would no man complaine of it presently? Or put it in writing, for instruc-

How vnlikely.

tion

tion of the posteritie? Surely, this can not be but a great wonder, ỳ the Cõmon Seruice of the west Church, was not generally in Latine euery where at ỳ beginning: And, that so many thousand Churches, in so many seuerall and diuerse Countries thereof, should altogether, most faithfully, hold and kepe the same: And no man yet tell, of what beginning. But what should a Catholike be troubled in his mind or geue eare to Seekers of quarells?

If the iust and quiet Possessours of Auncient and good Landes, should be made to bring foorth Euidencies, and, either answer to all demaundes whiche it pleaseth the Aduersarie to moue, or elis to be quyte and cleane thrust out of all, without any further iudgmẽt: would it not be accompted so vnreasonable and iniuriouse, that no wise man or honest man, could alowe it or suffer it? what cause then is there, why the troublers of quyet possessours in Religion, should be praysed and honored, as ghostly Scrutyers (I trow) of all Christendome? How hold you this, quod he? Mary, what is that to thee? Thou seest I hold it. Yea but how came you by it? First who gaue you the authoritie to aske me that question?

Enchroching and busy heretikes.

Then spare not, but lay it to my charge, if thou hast any euidence against me. It was not so in the Primitiue Church. Yes forsooth was it. Bring me then (sayeth he) any sufficient authority of Doctor or Councell. Folish felow, wilt thou put me to my proofes, which am in possessyon, and haue long dwelt here, as it can not be denied, thy self being not able to shew from whence I had it, except it were of the first Lordes and Patrones? what right I haue, the same I haue receiued. And those that deliuered it to me, toke it of others before them. And they againe, receiued it of their forefathers. Neither canst ỹ proue any chaunge of Titles to haue come in betwene, from the first Apostles & Fathers, to their children which now do liue. Is it not therfore a sufficient defence to vs, that thou canst not deny, but the west Church doth vse, and hath (for hundred of yeres together) spokē Latin generally in her Seruice, and art not able to shew, where she euer vsed English, Dutch, French, or Spanish? Thy silence in this question doth answer for vs. And it should be a demonstration to all reasonable men, that vndoubtedly the publike Seruice here in the

west

weast was in Latin from the beginning, Traditiõ for the ca-tholikes.
because, no other beginning therof can be shewed, nor the ceasing of those vnlgare Tongues, which (as M. Iewel getteth) were once vsed, can any where be found, or espied. Thus much should and would be said, if the right way might be alowed.

But now, present possession maketh nothing. And therfore is D. Harding constrained, to folow ỹ pleasure of ỹ Extremities, & to proue, that to be ours of auncient ryght: ỹ long possession wherof without any disturbãce, cõcludeth it to be our right, wherein though he hath done very well, yet he bringeth nothing, but M. Iewel turneth it to a gesse, a likelihode, a coniecture. Which phrases are so common wyth hym, through all this Article, as though he would admit no Authority or Argument, but such as is taken out of the Scriptures, or such as should be so euident and inuincible, that he could haue no power to answer them. His Phrases are these:

M. Harding is not able to proue this with all his gesses. Iewel. 160
Againe: The Minor he warranteth but by a gesse only. 166
Againe: Reply is made and that by gesses and likelihods. 180
Againe: This gesse standeth vppon two poynts,

poynts. And so in other places moe.

For this cause, that it may be perceiued, whether he allso vseth not Cheates, & that he may learn in time, to be good to others, when he is fauorable to him selfe: before I speake of D. Hardinges reason, let vs a while hold our peace, and put M. Iewel to answering.

Tel vs, I pray you, Sir, for truths sake, you which are so well seene in Antiquities, and can appose, and presse others so earnestly with obscure questions about the Primitiue Church: Is it not reason that you geue better instructions, which finde fault with the Catholikes opinions? And if the iudgment and answere of the whole Church that now is, can not satisfye you: should you, with any conscience, require your opinion to be receiued, except ye bring Demonstrations for it?

Tell vs therfore I beseeche you, without Gesses, Coniectures, and Likelihodes, (which you can not away withall,) was *the publike Seruice of the Churche, within the six hundred yeares after Christ, in the Syriacal, or Arabike, in the AEgiptian, AEthiopian, Persian,* Arme-

Harding Pol. 74.

Armeniã, Scythiã, Frẽch, or Britain tounge? Here you may answer vnto vs:

This is no indifferent dealing. And again: Sodainly he altereth the whole state of the cause, and shifteth his handes and requireth me to shew. But, that it may appeare you deale plainly, and seeke nothing but truthe: Answer I pray you throughly and durectly. In one example or two, you are content, but why not in examples for all? For the Syriacal tounge you speake the moste, but why bring you not somewhat for eche of the other? You will refer the rest to an other place (vnto which straighte waies we will folowe you) but presently thus you say. Iew. 165

At Paulaes funerall, all the multitude of the Citye of Palestine met together. The Psalmes were songe in order, in Hebrewe, Greeke, Latine, and Syrian tonge. Hierony mus in Epitaphio Paule. Gra m B fo 60 a c 4 fo 86 a b

Well, here in dede is mention of the Syrian Tounge, and of Psalmes songe in it. But how prove you, these Psalmes to infer the Cõmon Service in the same tounge? For, by Psalmes, I vnderstand Hymnes, Songes, and Praises, made to the honor of God, and memorie of S. Paula. For Theodoretus reporteth (as you beare me witnesse) Lib. 4. cap. 29.

witnesse) that Ephrem made Hymnes and Psalmes in the Syrian tounge, And that the same were songe at the solemne Feastes of Martyrs. All Psalmes therefore, were not the Psalmes of Dauid (for Ephrem made new of his owne) and the synginge of Psalmes at Paulaes funerall, proue not, but by Gheasse, that they were part of the Common Seruice. And therefore, though ye haue brought forth a place where mention is made of Psalmes in the Syrian tounge: yet doe ye not satisfie our demaud and expectation, whiche aske of Publike Seruice, and looke to be, playnly and euidently answered.

Lib. 4. ca. 29. Iew. 157

Here beginneth M. Iew. with his gesses.

Ye adde vnto this, a testimonie out of S. Augustine, where he willeth the priestes to correct the errors of their Latine speache: That the people vnto the thinge they playnly vnderstand, may say Amen. And what of this? This (say you) of S. Augustine, seemeth to be spoken generally of all Tounges.

Iew. 156

To whome seemeth it? To your self (I thinke) and your cumpanie only. And if to any other beside, it should likewise seeme so, yet Seeming hangeth but vpon Gheasses and lykelihoodes. And therefore is, neither

In other gesse of M. Iew.

cher to be vsed of you, which are to resolute to allege them: neither to be named against vs, which seeke now after your Euidences and perfect Instructions, and must not be serued with Lykelihoodes.

But ye refer vs to another place. To that place then will we come, and repete our question again.

VVhether your side is able to shew, that the publik Seruice of the Church in any nation Was (in the Syriacall, or Arabike, or AEgyptiã, AEthiopiã, Persian, Armenian, Scythian, Frẽch, Britaine tounge, or) in any other then in Greeke and Latine.

Here you may againe finde fault as you did before and say: He altereth cunningly the whole case, and willeth me to shew. But we shall desire you againe, to be cõtent and yelde to our request: If there be such goodnesse and pregnancie of your cause, as you speake of, and specially if ye speake for the better contentation of the Good Christian Reader. But remember that ye must exidently answeer vs without Gheasses, and Iew. 157

Lykeli-

Likelihodes. Go to then, wher begin you?

Iew. 175 Eckius sayeth, the Indians had their Seruice in the Indian tounge. Durandus saith, the Iewes that were Christened had their Seruice in the Hebrewe tounge.

Call ye this, A contentation of a good Christian Readers mind, to proue vnto hym a Conclusion, by those mennes sayinges, whome, by your example, the better and perfiter Christian he is, the lesse he must accept for witnesses? what tel ye vs now, of Eckius and Durandus, whom you make vs not to passe vpon? This kind of reasoning of their authority, whome you would haue vs thinke to be of no Authority, is more weake & vncertain, then if ye should aime onlye and gesse at the matter, whiche we loke to be fully quieted in, by your muche reading and learning. Eckius also sayeth no more, but it was permitted. And he speketh of that which was done a this side the six hundred yeres, to the which only, your answer should be referred. And Durádus maketh no mention of Iewes, as though the celebration of the mysteries, had ben for their sakes done in Hebrew, but of the beginnings of the primitiue Church, in which not only Iewes but Gentiles also in great num-

Where we ke (after M. Iewel mind) the a gesse.

Eckius in Locis communibus.

number came to the faith of Christ, he saieth generally: In the primitiue Churche, the Diuine Mysteries were celebrated in the Hebrew tounge. Of which we may iustly gather, that euery Christian vnderstode not the Seruice, because more then Iewes were then Christened, and the Hebrewe tounge was not vulgar to any, sauing Iewes. So that the tongue which they vsed in the Diuine mysteries, was straunge and vnknowen vnto many, which from Paganisme were conuerted to Christ. Lib. 4. cap. 1.

But Nycolaus de Lyra, and Thomas of Aquine say (authors whome you thinke worthy of small credit) the Common Seruice, in the Primitiue Church, was in the Common vulgar tongue. Iew. 175 An other gheasse of M. Iew.

This is true, though it were but in the Greeke or Latin tounge only. And so doth it not answer our question throughly.

But what if D. Harding him selfe haue in plaine wordes confessed, that Common praiers were pronoūced in the primitiue Church in a Common tounge knowen to the people? Iew. 17? wors this a gheasse

But when he shall answer you, that he taketh not Common praiers and Common Seruice both for one thing, (which without what if I am sure he will doe) what is that, to the question which we put forth:

Or how haue ye answered, to the Contentation of your good Christian reader? Thus then, all this hytherto is litle or nothinge worth. And we loke for strōger argumentes at your learned handes. And therefore perchaunce you say:

Iew. 176 Yet Good Christian Reader for thy better satisfaction, it may please thee to knowe,

Far from the question. that in the Primitiue Church, the Common Seruice was not ministred, by one man alone, but by the Priest and whole Congregation, altogether.

But was it in any other tounge, then Greeke or Latine? This is demaunded, to this you haue to answer. And remember here your blind Senator, which talked and

Iew. 317 pointed to the higher end of ỹ table, ỹ Mullet which he so much praised, being far beneth, at the lower end.

Clemens Alexandrinus sayeth, In the

Iew. 176 An other gesse of M. Iew. Common Prayers they haue all, as it were, one voice and one mynd.

So may they, though it be out of publike Seruice. Also where he talketh of Prayers

Falshode. indefinitely, you adde the word (Common) vnto them, leaste it should be any thinge doubtfull. What call you that, a Bheaste, or a Beaste?

S. Chryſoſtome ſayeth, not only the Prieſt geaueth thankes, but alſo all the People. Iew. 176 In other Gheaſse of M. Iew.

That is, becauſe he is a publike Miniſter, to whoſe prayers all the people muſt ioyne their conſentes, ſo that they are not excuſed if they thinke of other matters when ỹ prieſt prayeth, but are bound to applie their deuotions to his, as in whom they all do ſerue God. But what is this to the vulgare Tongue in Publike Seruice? Iew. 176 Moe Gheaſſes.

Iſydorus writeth thus: when they ſinge they muſt ſinge all togeher, when they pray, they muſt pray all together.

He ſpeaketh of the Clergie only, that ye needе not extend it to the laye people. And therfore, if you haue no better then this, we may well put you to other prooſes. which are not far of.

For, out of ỹ old father Origen, you tell vs: That al ſeueral nations, pray vnto god and praiſe him in their mother tongue. Iew. 176 Moe Gheaſſes.

This may be done in Priuat prayers, And our requeſt is, to haue ſure argumentes for Publike Seruice.

Out of S, Ambroſe, There were Iewes (ſay you) which in their Sermons and Oblations, vſed ſometime the Syrian tongue and Iew. 176 Moe Gheaſſes.

some tymes the Hebrew.

This perteineth then to Sermons and Offeringes, not to Common prayers. And it was, you may perceaue, no appointed and sett order of Common seruice, in which they changed their tongues so, at their pleasures.

Iew. 176. Out of S. Basil, ye tell vs, of Such, as offered vp to the lord the Psalme of Confession. And againe, ye number out of him, Egyptians, and bothe the Countries of Lybia, and the Thebanes, Palestines, Arabians, Phenicians, Syrians, and the borderers of Euphrates, and generally all, that haue VVatchinges, and Prayers, and Common Psalmodie in estimation.

Woe to Hypocrites.

177.

But to what purpose name ye, al these diuerse countries. To make that cleere, which we doubted of: and to proue, ẏ the publike Seruice was, at those dayes, in so many tongues: By what reason or argument: because al these, had common Psalmodie in estimation: And who, emonge vs, esteemeth it not? Take you rather heede to this, of whose Psalmodie it may be doubted, which haue so litle prayinge, and

and no watching. But what meane you here, by Common Psalmodie? Thinke you that al these countries so seuerall, mett in one Place, and songe Psalmes together? that is incredible. How then? wil you gather this sense of it, that the same Psalmes were reade and songe euery where? Tell vs then in what tongue they were vsed? And consider, whether one tongue, (as the Greeke for example) might not haue serued to that purpose? For in the weast now, we know the selfe same Psalmes, yea and text also, euery where to be vsed. But was not this S. Basiles meaninge, that the manner of watchinge, Prayinge, and singinge Psalmes, should not seeme straunge and newly inuented, because it is allowed & practised in so many and seuerall countries? yes verely this only is his meaninge. for, certaine heretikes there were then, which stirred vp the myndes and stomakes of the Clergie of Neocæsaria, perswadinge them, that the old manner and Custome of synging Psalmes was changed, and saying: At non erant hæc tempore Gregorii Magni. But theese thinges were not in

Basil. in epist. ad Cler. Neocæ.

Gregorie the Great his dayes. Vnto whom S. Basil answereth, that ỹ maner of psalmodie which he vseth, is not his particular, but common to him and Egiptians, and both Contries of Lybia, and the Thebanes etc. But where finde you here (M. Iew.) that these psalmes were in the peculiar tongue, of euerie of these countries, or that they were of the publike Seruice? S. Basile speaketh no further, but concerning the order of singe them, and you make him to beare you witnesse, in what tongue those psalmes were vttered.

Iew. 177 In other Gheasse of M. Iewels.

Out of S. Hierome you proue to vs, That the voices and letters of all nations, do sound out Christ his passion and Resurrection.

As who should say, that, in Kynge Henry the seauenths tyme, the publike Seruice in England was not in the Latine tonge, because many English bokes did intreate of Christes passion and Resurrection, and because the people in their vulgar tongue did speake much of it.

Lesse then a Gheasse for the Seruice in the primitiue Church. Iew. 177

Out of Aeneas Syluius, you say, A voice was heard, as it had ben from heauen! (And now you begynne, deuoutly to hearken to Reuelations, though neuer written in go spell, nor six hundered yeares after Christ)

Let

Let euerie ſpirit prayſe the lord, and let euerie tonge acknowledge him. And that thereupon, the Sclauons were ſuffered to vſe their owne tonge in their Common Seruice.

When chaunſed this? About the yeare of our Lord eight hundred and threeſkore.

That is to ſay, ye come to late by two hundred and threeſkore yeares or thereabout, to proue what was done in the ſix hundred yeares after Chriſt. Againe, ſuch ſute, for the Sclauons, as you ſpeake of, to haue the Cõmon Seruice in their moother tongue, proueth what was ordinarily vſed then to the contrarie in al Chriſtendome. The great ſtaie of the Pope and Cardinals in grauntinge it, declareth how Straunge, Needeleſſe, or daungerouſe, the Rulers of ỹ Church, 800. and odd yeares ſence, thought that requeſt to be. The voice from heauen importeth, that it neaded a ſpeciall ſigne and teſtimonie to obtaine a diſpenſation in a matter ſo extraordinarie.

Out of Innocentius, you bringe, ye cannot tell what. But firſt what was this Innocentius? A Pope of Rome. when lyued he? About 300. yeares ſence. And dare you confirme your cauſe, with Popes decrees, of ſo late yeares? But where, decreed he this? In the Councel of Lateran. That

Councel, which of all other ye most detest, as in which Transsubstantiation, was in expresse termes declared, and in which the kyngedome (as you will say) of ỹ Popishe Church was defended. Is it possible then, (to goe no further) that, out of that world and Councel, a Decree should be alleged by the which, M. Jewels Schismaticall opinion should be confirmed?

Who so bold as Jewel.

Consider by this one example, (indifferent Reader) how this felow abuseth thy unskilfulnesse, or lacke of leysure to examin the places, which he allegeth out of the Auncient fathers, or practise of the Primitine Church: which dareth, as it were, at high noone, and in ỹ very sight of ỹ world, to make men beleue, that Innocentius (forsooth) the third, was a fauorer of their proceedinges? And so to interpret his wordes and sett them fourth in great letters, as though he had decreed, that if (for example) Englishe men, Douch men, French men, Italians, Spaniardes &c. were mengled together in one Cirye, the Bishope thereof, should prouide meete men, to minister the

Iew. 177. holy Seruice, ACCORDINGE TO THE DIVERSITIE OF THEIR MANNERS AND TONGVES, which should be to say, In English, Douch, French

French &c.

But doth Innocentius meane so? May doth he say so? for if ye dare to set furth his wordes in Latin as though your fidelitie should be seene, and yet, in the Englishinge of them, corrupt the same wordes: who may trust you in your Comment and construction vpon them? Prouideant (sayeth he, of the Bishopes of such Cityes or dioceses, where sundrie nations dwelled together) viros idoneos qui secundum diuersitates rituum & linguarum diuina ILLIS officia CELEBRENT EI ECCLESIASTICA SACRAMENTA administrēt. That is, we straightly commād, ỳ the Bishope of such Cityes, *prouide meete mē, which according to the diuersitie of Rites and Tongues, maye celebrat ỳ diuine Seruice vnto thē, & minister the Sacramentes of the Church.*

But, M. Iew. leaueth out quite the interpretation of Illis celebrent may celebrate vnto them: And, Ecclesiastica Sacramenta, The Sacramentes of the Church makinge of two verbes but one, and of two Accusatiue cases but one: and applicinge

M. Iewels falshoode, and that to make but a Gheasse.

plienge ỹ verbe to ỹ former Accusatiue case, which should gouerne ỹ later only: and leauinge the later accusatiue case, not only
Iew. 177 without the proper verbe to rule it, but altogeather leauinge it out. As in example. VVe doe therfore straightly commaund that the Bishopes of such Cities or dioceses prouide meete men to minister (he should haue added ỹ proper accusatiue case: The Sacramentes of the Church, but it lacketh him not, he leaueth it out quite) The holy Seruice (he should haue put before it the proper verbe belonging to it: To celebrate vnto them, the diuine or holy Seruice. for, by sayinge vnto them, the Pope, signifieth, that the people sayed not the seruice, but the priest.) ACCORDING to the diuersitie of their manners (more playnly it would haue ben sayed, their Rites or Ceremonies) and tongues.

If any man thinke this omission to be of smal importance: I answer, that in him, which is so curious to note in the Margen Rituum & Linguarum, and to english them in ỹ text with great letters, the better to be considered, in him, it is no smal fault to place and construe wordes at his pleasure, and to conueygh those away out of the sentence, which beinge left alone, doe open

and

and expound the whole matter. For interpretinge ỹ Canõ truly, your greate doubte M. Iewel (of Accordinge to the Vniuersitie of their manners and tongues) will easily be answered. for the Bishopes (*to make it plaine*) *are commaunded, to prouide meete men, to celebrate the diuine Seruice vnto thẽ, Accordinge to the diuersitie of their manners or Rites, and to minister the Sacramẽtes of the Church vnto them, accordinge to the diuersitie of their tongues.* For as it is not enough, to bringe a simple Italian, (if he would be confessed and absolued) to a priest of the Latine Church, but to such a one, as vnderstandeth and speaketh ỹ Italiã tongue: So in sayinge of Seruice to the same man, it is enough to keepe the Rites and Ceremonies which he hath ben vsed vnto, in his owne countrie, and it is not required that it should be saied in the Italian tongue. because in Confession respect is had to singular persons, but in publik Seruice ỹ whole state of the Church is considered. In confession also the priestes goe downe to men, but in publike Seruice they ascend

ascend vpward to God. In talking with men our tongue should be knowen vnto them, in praieinge to God the chiefe care ps of deuotion. And therfore, it was not sincerely done of M. Iew. so to turne, & leaue out, the wordes of this decree: neither are litle omissions in this kinde, litle faultes.

Who then may trust him with expoundinge the wordes? or what hope might he haue, so to handle the matter, that Innocentius the third, might seme to condemne his owne Church of Rome: and straightly commaund, that according to the diuersitie of manners and tonges the holy Seruice should be ministred? Was this law euer put in execution in Rome it selfe? was it not an easie matter, for him beinge Pope, to doe it? Did not sundrie nations of diuerse tõgues mete in that Citie together, to geaue him occasion to do it? yet hath he not done it. and the Romaines continew still their Seruice in the Latine, though their vulgar speach be Italian. It appeareth then that Innocentius had no such meaninge as you deuise.

And note the wordes of the decree. Let meete men be prouided, to celebrate and ministre to People of diuerse Countries, Accordinge

sordinge to the diuersitie of their Rites and tongues. Here I would aske, what diuersitie it speaketh of? Such as was not yet extant in the Church, or such as was presently vsed? If ye meane the first: that can not be. for of those Rites which are not yet, who can say, Let them be serued accordinge to the diuersitie of their Rites! If ye meane the second, that is, If ye vnderstand, that such diuersitie of Rites and tongues as was then all readie found in the Catholike Church, should be vsed toward ỹ people of euerie countrie, where diuerse nations met togeather, within one Citie or dioceſe: this proueth not, that the English men dwellinge at Rome, should haue a new English Seruice made for them, but only, that the like Rites and tongue, as were vsed in their Countrie at home, in their Cõmon Seruice, should be enioyed of them in Rome. After the which rate, the Italians abidinge in Constantinople, should haue the Latin Seruice, and not the Greeke: And the Greekes in Venice, should haue the Seruice after their owne manner, and not after the Latine.

The right meaning of Innocentius decree.

But what is this to our question? for to make

make it playner, let vs suppose ẏ, a French man dwellinge then in Rome, with other his countrie men, wold require to haue his Common prayer in the French tongue. To him would I say, by what reason or consequent doest thou require it? Here, let his answer be, how Innocentius decreed, that euery nation should be prouided for, according to the diuersitie of their manners and tongues. I would aske him againe, what manner or tongue haste thou, in the Church Seruice in Fraunce? If he answered, we haue the French: he should be taken in an open lye, because none was than thought vpon. If he answered, (as ẏ truth was) we haue it in Latin but we haue other fashions in it, then these of Rome haue: then should he perceaue Innocentius and the Councels meaninge. which was that the celebratinge of publike Seruice, and ministration of Sacramentes, as it was then presently vsed, in seuerall Countries: so should it be in a readinesse for the men of ẏ same Countries (when they met together in one Citie) accordinge to ẏ diuersitie of their Rites and tongues.

Therfore if you (M. Iew.) can shew by any meanes, that the Church Seruice of England

England was, at that tyme, in the English tonge, then may I graunt vnto you, ỹ when ye goe to Rome or Constãtinople, you may clayme the benefite of Innocẽtius decree to be serued English wise. But if you can not find, that in any of so many seuerall Countries, as may be reckoned, the Seruice was then in any other tongue then Greeke or Latin, then shal you see it plainly and necessarily concluded, that euery of them was prouided for. According to the diuersitie of Rites and tongue (Tonge, you must meane, which they vsed in publik Seruice, and in Churches, and not in open Market Place, or Pryuate howses) and yet no one of them all should haue other tongue then Greeke or Latine. And therfore, this testimonie doth not serue you, nor satisfie vs. And byside this, I must tell you, that were it neuer so good and fitt for your purpose, yet is it byside your Glorie, to vse Popes decrees of so late makinge.

Now to conclude: M. Iew. signifieth vnto vs, that he might allege much more, euen out of Abdias him selfe, whom M. Hardinge so much esteemeth. But I will only note the complaint of one Iohn Bil- Iew. 17.

let

A lamentation of some of his frudes vpon M. Iewel would see us here wel, for because the Complaints of John Billet.

let. whome (I beleue) you as much esteme as you doe Abdias. But wherein will ye note his complaint? Concerninge this case? what case? whether that, The Common Seruice was not ministred, by one man a lone, but by the Priest and the whole Congregatiō together, which is ỹ thinge ye promised to shew? Or that the publike Seruice was, in the six hundred yeares after Christ, in any other tongue then Greeke or Iew. 176 Latine, which question was only demaunded, and vnto which, you were content to answer, for the better Contentation of myndes, and better satisfaction of the Reader?

Goe to then, what eyleth that, One Iohn Iew. 178 Billet, as you cal hym, and whereof complayneth he? Mary what shall we do (sayeth he) in our dayes, when as there is, either none at al, or very seldome, that readeth or heareth, or vnderstandeth

Understandeth what? the publike Seruice? no but the Gospell which was readen in the Seruice. for the wordes next before, are, that whereas in the Primitiue Church no man should speake with tongues, onlesse some were present to expound them: here of (sayeth he) *grew a laudable Custome ỹ after ỹ Gospell was read litterally*

it

it should straight waies be expounded in the vulgar tongue. And there vpon foloweth his Complaint: what shall we do in our dayes &c. He complaineth therfore of lacke of learninge in the Reader or hearer: not of the vnknowen Tongue in which the Gospell was read. for if the exposition of it doe folow in ỹ vulgar tongue, the Custome is laudable. And so hereby is presupposed, that the Gospell was then in another tongue then vulgar.

But now if the exposition foloweth not, and few either readers or hearers vnderstand the Gospell: what is to be done? Verely the suerest way is, to sett moe Childrē to schole, and to make better prouision for Scholars, and to chouse out of Scholars, into the Clergie. But what is your aduise M. Iew.? mary, ỹ the Service (I trow) should be in the vulgar tongue. But ye find not this, in Iohn Billets complaint. And except you gather this Conclusion, how make ye an end of your processe with his testimonie? Marke, I pray you (M. Iewel) Iohn Billets conclusion vpon his owne Complaint. It seemeth (sayeth he) It were better now to hould their peace, then

then so to singe. Lo, he talketh of holdinge their peace in the Church, not of cryenge out in the vulgar tongue. Neither wisseth he nor alloweth he ỹ takinge vp of a new tongue and Seruice, but of amendinge the ignorance of hearers and readers concerninge the old. Also he sayeth, It seemeth: but determineth nothinge. And therfore it is a wonder that you espied not that Gheasse of his, wherby, we (though it made for your purpose) are not satisfied. And, to be as exact as your selfe are, he was not within the first six hundred yeares after Christ. Therfore you haue sayed hitherto, with al your Gheasses nothinge to the purpose, nor proued, that the Seruice was in the Primitiue Church in some other tongue, then Greeke or Latine.

yet moe Gheasses of M. Iewel.

But perchaunce the neerer you come homeward, ỹ better you be instructed. and therfore leauinge to aske you of the Syrian, AEthiopian, Persian and Armenian with ỹ lyke, what say you to the French tongue? was the Seruice of Gallia, (now Fraunce) in the vulgar tongue, within the six hundred after Christ? It was not sayed (you will answere) in such order as M. Harding Gheasseth.

Iew. 184

Do you

Doe you then tell vs without Gheasses I pray you, how it was.

But in a knowen tounge vnto the people. Iewel.

What was that? Speake M. Iewel. Tel vs of some certaintie, for of al things you loue no Gheasses

That it was in a tounge knowen vnto the people it is euident by Seuerus Sulpitius. Iewel.

To all or some? for herein consisteth the very point. To some, we graunt, and that helpeth you nothing. To all, how proue you, out of Sulpitius, or any other? Here againe you be at a staie. But goe ye foorth with Sulpitius.

The Reader was shut out, by meane of the thronge. One of the companie toke the Psalter, Read the verse of the Psalme: Out of the mouth of Infantes and Sucklings, thou hast wrought prayse. And as sone as that verse was read, the people made a shout, and the contrarie part was confounded. Here we see the practise of the Church of Gallia. Moregeses for the seruice in ỹ vulgare tounge, Iewel.

A proper practise I promise you, that as soone as the verse of the Psalme was read, the people made a shout. Thinke you, that this Psalme, and Readinge, of ỹ which Sulpitius speaketh, was any part of the

Publike Seruice? Or thinke you, the people to haue bene so wyld and dissolute at those dayes, that they made shoutes, when they were in their Seruice? But this is enough for you, that they made a shoute. By which you gather, that they vnderstoode what was readde. Yet doe ye not satisfie our question, which is of Publike Seruice, and whether all the people vnderstode it or no.

The historye which Sulpitius telleth, M. Iew. mangleth.

But M. Iewell, if it had pleased you, to haue reported this Historie as Sulpitius telleth it, neither we coulde wonder at the peoples shoute: neither you make an argument thereof, that they vnderstoode the Church Seruice. For to adde, to your tale that which lacketh, when S. Martyne stoode to be Bisshoppe, one of the cheefe Bysshopes of the Countrie (whose name was DEFENSOR) was his greateste Aduersarye. For which cause, the People beinge offended with hym, when that verse, of whiche you speake was readen, in the end of the whiche, these wordes are (accordinge to an olde Latine translation) Vt destruas inimicum & defensorem they hearinge the worde DE-

Sulpitius lib. i. de vita D. Marti.

FEN-

FENSOREM, some for ioy (I beleue) that it allnded so rightely to the name of theyr Aduersarye, and other perchaunce of Symplicitie, thinkinge that the Psalme did speake of DEFENSOR the Bisshope, made a shoute, And signified or agreed, that it was happelye spoken. whiche, I see not howe it proueth the publike Seruice to haue bene in a knowen tounge, and all the People to haue vnderstanden it. But this I mighte gather, that the Psalmes were then openly readde in the Latine tounge.

In whiche thinge what is your opinion, M. Iewel? In what toung (thinke you) was the Common Seruice of the Church of France? You answer: Whether it were in the vulgar Tounge or in the Latine Tounge, it was a Tounge knowen to the People. Iew. 148

But doth this answer, agree with your absolute intelligence, whiche would be compted to knowe the state of the Primitiue Churche so perfectlye: that what so euer others bringe agaynste you, it muste bee taken for Coniectures onlye, and Gheasses? See now, in what darkenesse of vnderstandinge, your selfe are.

And how much you be to seking, when you be partycularly apposed?

M. Iew. at a stay. You say of France, that they had theyr Seruice in a knowen tounge: but what tounge that was, you can not readily tell. And why so? Can ye say precisely, that all the people vnderstoode it (for of all the people our question is) except ye be sure what toũge it was? And if it wer in any other then ỹ vulgar French, can ye warrãt that the whole Congregation vnderstode it? And marke, that they must not only vnderstand it simply, but also turne it to theyr purpose cunnyngly. Except you thinke, that it was an easye matter for euery body to do (at the reading of the foresayd verse of the Psalme) to perceaue the allusion and conueyghance, which might be made, from defensorem the worde of the Psalme, to DEFENSOR the Bysshope that resisted S. Martine. And that in one instant, euery man did make the sense of the Psalme to answer and serue his iust indignation against DEFENSOR the Bisshope, and so gaue an vniforme shout, for that they goodwills, and the meaninge of that verse of the Psalme, did so happely meete both together.

And

And if, as I doe now tel it, there be thousandes which wil not perceaue it, for lacke (not of Englishe) but of quicke vnderstanding or close attention: who may thinke, that all the vulgar people, vnderstoode the grace of that facte not looked for, whiche Sulpitius declareth? Or that they being not able to conteine them selues, for the greatenes and agreeablnes which they saw in it, brake out into a shout or acclamation?

But herein is your craft and subtiltie M. Iewel ỳ, vnder the generalitie or indefirenes of wordes, ye prouide to kepe some gappes alwayes open, by which you may shift frome sense to sense, and prolonge the tyme of your taking. For wher ye can safely saye it without espying, that, the seruice was in the vulgar tounge: there will you meane by a Strange toũge, that which is not vulgar, in which sense, the Latin toũge, in England, is a strange tounge. And where it is lyke to be playnly proued against you, that the Common Seruice was in another tounge then the vulgar: There, by a Strange tounge, you will vnderstand, not a contrary to the vulgar, but a contrary to the knowen tounge, & so in this sense

the Latine is not a Strange tounge in Englande, because it is vnderstanden of the inhabitours, though not generallye of all.

And so by this kinde of Shiftinge in the question of the Common Seruice of Gallia, where it appeareth, by that one verse of the Psalme which Seuerus Sulpitius reherseth, that it was in Latine, there, ye care not for the distinction: but, whether it were in the vulgare tounge or in the Latine, it was (you say) in a Tounge knowen to the people.

Present shiftes at a nead.

Iew. 184

But, when we shall come to our owne Countrye of Englande, and beginne to proue, that Seruice there, was in Latine: You can not abyde to heare it, but you will needes haue it to be in the vulgare Tounge.

Yet ye nede not so to answer (if it pleased you) because, if the Latine Tounge were graunted, to haue bene in the Publike Seruice of England, when Sainte Augustine conuerted it: Yet might ye as well answer, that the Latine was a knowen Tounge there; as you seeme easye to be perswaded, that it was a knowen

tounge

Tounge, to al the people in France.

By which your handlynge of the matter, it is moste euidente, that you are sure lytle or nothinge, of the state of the Primitiue Churche concerninge the Particulars of it, but, that you frame your conclusion to your knowlege.

And where you fynde, that the Seruice was in the Latine Tounge, there will you make, that the Latine was a knowen Tounge: And where your selfe can fynde nothinge, nor your Aduersarye bryngе for his purpose playne euidence: there wyll you reste, and saye, that the Common Seruyce was in the Vulgare Tounge only.

Againste which your Determination, if it shoulde be proued hereafter that the Latine Seruice was vsed, euen there, where you thoughte otherwise: then woulde you (without all doubte) retorne to your foresayed place of Euasion, that Whether it were in the Vulgar Tounge, or in the Latine, it was a Tounge knowen to the People.

Nowe to leane all other Churches of the worlde, and for your readines M. Iewel,

and our shortnesse sake, to speake to you of England only: In what tongue was the Seruice there at the beginning? That beginning I meane, when we were first conuerted to the faith by S. Augustin? whom your Simplicity, and holinesse, and mercifulnesse, and humility aboue measure, is so good as to iudge, to be vnworthy to be called a Saincte, but an Hypocrite, a Superstitious man, Cruell, Bloudy, and Proud aboue measure, and that by the reporte of them, which sawe him and knewe him. As who should say, that such men were meete vessels, for God to dwell in, and woorke the conuersion of Idolatours, such as our forefathers (according to the flesh) were: Or, as though S. Gregorye, which sent him, sawe him not, and knew him not, yea and tried him not better before he sent him, then any Britains could doe, which stomaked & enuied his doinges, when he was come nerer vnto them: Or, as thoughe this were an high poynt in your Schooles, when a question is asked of the Seruice which any Country had at the first conuersion therof, to defame and slaunder that Person, which first conuerted it, and put forthe, to be marked of others, or lightly beleue it your selfe,

Is this your Te Deũ Laudamus, for S. Augustines coming in to England, and cõuerting it. Iew. 185

the

the worſt that the malice of the enemy could ſpeake againſt him, without any counterpoyſing of it, with the iuſt and true commẽdations, which, the beſt men then liuing, or the generall voyce of the world afterwards, gaue vnto him. To ſay no more vnto you for this blabbing or ſlaundering, then God reward you for it, I continue in my queſtion, aſking you:

What manner tongue was vſed in the Common Seruice of England, at the firſt conuerſion of it? The Latine you will not graunt to haue bene vſed, though S. Auguſtine with other Monkes, planted then by likelihoode, no other then thẽ ſelues knew: except you thinke that they ſtayed frõ publike Myniſtration, vntill them ſelues had learned our Engliſh, or taught the people with all ſpeede to vnderſtand their Latine) and though S. Gregory reioyſed that Alleluya was ſonge in England.

But, theſe be but gheaſſes, you ſay. And Maiſter Harding ſhould not thus mocke the world. He knoweth well a Childe woulde not make ſuch reaſons. Againe: God wot he might haue made it better. Iewi. 185 185. 136 188

Wel Sir, for this purpoſe I am deſirous to heare your anſwers becauſe ye wot, they

neede

neede to be absolute and excellent, whiche come from your grauity and learning. If then our Common Seruice were not in the Latine: was it in ỹ Hebrew, or Greke, or any vnknowen tounge? For ye seeme to incline to the surmises of ỹ Brittish Chronicles concerning Ioseph of Arimathæa, and to the report of Theodoretus, that S. Paule
567 came into this Ilande, nowe called England. So that it is hard to say, what Antiquities you haue in store, concerninge this matter.

Yet because ỹ greatest part hereof is like to be proued by Surmises, I beleue rather that your finall answer will be, that the Seruice in Englande, was in the vulgar English tounge. But howe proue you this? So common a thing, as the publike Seruice, So farre and wide spred a brode, as the Realme of England is long and rounde, So generally planted as you suppose, So diligently remembred and marked, as people muste doe, whyche (by your reade) must say Amen, and vnderstand the Priest when he celebrateth: This to be so taken away, that you can shewe no token whether euer it was or

no.

no, is it credible, or is it possible?

Can ye thē blame vs, if we aske for some Monumentes and Bookes, to be shewed out of one place or other, Or if none at all be founde, (for no doubt you haue searched and labored) can ye blame vs if we doubt of the matter? Yet say you:

O what foly is this?

What to doe? to aske for witnesses in a doubtfull matter? And to loke for some steppe of a foote or token of highe way, which thousand thousandes haue Ordinarily, and Openly passed by?

Iew. 187 How loth or vnable rather M. Iewel is to shew any euidence.

But, who is able to shewe anye Booke wrytten in Englyshe a thousande yeares a goe?

Iew. 187

If ye can not shewe a whole booke, yet shewe but a peece of the leafe of one: Or some token or testimonye thereof, that euer any such booke was vsed.

It foloweth:

Or if it could be shewed, yet who were able to vnderstand it?

You may see then, how vaine it is, to thinke that the Apostles or their successors did commit the woorde of God to vulgare tonges, which being so subiect vnto chāges

could

coulde not well be trusted with the preseruing of the true Scriptures. For if the English Seruice (which vndoubtedly, if any suche had bene consisted of the holye Scriptures) if it should haue had the scriptures translated into it, there to be kept for the Christians: in what case should we haue bene nowe, being not able to vnderstande that English? Or in what case shoulde the Scripture it selfe haue bene, if, as the propriety of the tongue was altered, so it shuld again be interpreted to the capacity of euery generation? Yet ye procede further.

There is no boke to be found of the prayers, that the Druides made in Fraunce, or the Gymnosophistæ in India. And will M. Harding therof conclude, that therfore the Druides or Gymnosophistæ praied in Latine? Iew. 187

1 First, how know you, what may be shewed, for the Gymnosophistes Prayers in India: How long studied you there? How narowly searched you? Or what certificates haue you receiued, of any man of

2 credit, from that Country? Consider then, that the Druides and Gymnosophistæ were Idolatours: & no maruel therfore, thoughe all their bokes and Superstitions be gone and consumed. But the Christians Ser-

nice

uice in the Vulgar tounge, pertaineth (you will say) to the substaunce of true religion, and coulde not therfore be so broughte to nought, that no monument therof should be remaining. Of the Druides also, and the Gymnosophistes, we know some what, the names (at the least) of them be preserued, and what men these were, we finde it expounded. But of the Seruice in English, before now of late, who euer read, who euer heard, who euer thought?

Neither doth Doctor Hardinge reason with you after this sort:

There is no old boke to be found of the Seruice in Englishe: ergo it was in Latine.

It is his maner, not so good as common.

This is but a tricke of your Logike M. Iewel, to alter the sense of your aduersary, and forme his arguments after your pleasure. But this rather is his reason. If the Seruice had bene in Englishe, considering the multitude of bookes and Churches, some memory would be left of it: But none is found, Ergo by good consequence there was neuer any such Seruice. And you, to shift your handes of this argument, doe make as though his only Demaunde were,

were, to haue Englishe bokes of the auncient Seruice brought forth: and as though his conclusion should be, if ye shewed not ẏ plaine bokes, Ergo ẏ seruice was in Latin.

But that you may not escape so, I will not aske you for Bookes, nor Monuments nor Relikes, nor tokens of the English seruice: But in this one, and reasonable, and easy question to be answered, I wold faine perceiue, what sense you haue or vnderstãding. when you were borne, and long before that, the Seruice in England was in the Latine tonge: If therfore it had not ben so, from the beginning: when began the Latine? when ceased the English?

Harding Fol. 88. Doubtlesse (sayeth D. Harding) some mention would haue bene made of the time & causes hereof. For, if in the smallest matters of the Church Seruice, there haue ben found, which haue noted the particulars, as that Damasus caused the Psalmes to be sõg by sides, and Thelesphorus made Gloria in excelsis to be song, and that S. Gregory added ẏ Anthems and Alleluya, & so in euery part of the Masse: Is it possible, ẏ so great a change of the publike Seruice from English into Latin, should not be marked of any man, or put in record by any wryter?

Was it done sodainly in the night, when

al were a slepe? Or in the morning, did euery man forget him self? Or were there no wryters then? Or were all corrupted? Or was there no Heretike, to leaue behind him a note of it: but ẏ such an euident, & wonderful chaũge of the whole Seruice, frõ English, (as you M. Iewel think) into Latine, should either not be espied, or not cõmitted to memory? what ãswer ye now vnto this?

M. Iewel. dum, and yet would not be known of it.

Ye answer not one worde, ye make, as though ye did not see it, ye pull ẏ reader frõ ẏ matter, to the Druides of France, & Gymnosophistes of India, ye speke as though D. Harding framed a direct argumẽt for ẏ Latine tounge, & asked you no question of the English Seruice. Ye cry out, O what a foly is this. And as though al mẽ were foles (for ye answer not one word to ẏ principal poynt) You do not bring so much as a gesse, a cõiecture, a likelihode. You steale away though you be cied, & the questiõ being so resonable you answer not one word to it. whẽ began ẏ Latin Seruice M. Iewel? whẽ ceased the English? If there be any thing in record of it, bring it forth: if ther be nothing, thẽ do I proue ẏ you are blind in thesematers, & ẏ al ẏ grace of your reply, & force of your lerning, cõsisteth in riseling of other mẽs argumẽts

(an

(an easy matter in Rhetorike) not in cõfirming any of your owne, which should not be to seking in a new Gospeller.

Thus haue I then discoursed with M. Iewel, about the publike Seruice in the Syriacall, Egyptian, Ethiopian, Persian, Armenian, Scythian, Frenche or Britain tounge.

I haue asked, whether he coulde proue any of these to haue bene vsed within the six hundred after Christ.

I haue requyred sure demonstrations, because he contemneth Coniectures and Gheasles.

I haue cõsidered both those common places of his, pa. 155. 175. in which he bringeth the best and moste that he can say for the Cõtentatiõ and Satisfactiõ of his reader.

I finde no mention of Publike Seruice in any tounge in the primitiue Church, byside Greeke or Latine.

He proueth his matters by Gheasles, he alleageth Authorities and Examples which were long sence the first six hundred yeres: to which tyme we bounde him as he doth vs.

I bring hym to the question of our owne coũtry, and leaue him not one likely word which

which he might answer.

And so (I trust) he will be taken, as he is, for a mover of contention, about other mēs right and possession, him self hable to bring furth no one scrap never so little, of any old Evidence to make expressely for his purpose. As for vs, this only, is a very good & sufficient answer, to say: We found at our comming vnto the faith of Christ the Latin Service, of y^e^ English we never herd before now of late: And surely, A chainge from Englishe into latine, could not be but noted in some place: And without evident demonstration to the contrarie, we ought not to be moved with any winde: & so we needed not to troble our selves any further, but put them to shew.

Yet, because D. Harding hath not dealt so sparingly, but hath ben content to bring good Reason and Authoritie for that, which was and is sufficiently defended, with the force and worthinesse of Traditiō, by which it hath ben commēded vnto vs: I therefore also, wil put furth and declare, that his argument, which he prosequuteth most in this Article. That by conferryng the order and weight of reasonynge on bothe sydes, it maie the soner and better appere which

of ỹ two, vseth more vncertain Gesses, Cõiectures, & lykelyhoodes. M. Iewel, whõ I haue proued to shewe nothing for Publike Seruice in ỹ vulgare tonge, or D. Harding, which shal be perceiued to cõclude directly for ỹ publike Seruice in Greeke or Latin, & not euery vulgar tonge. First thẽ,

Iew. 151 The questiõ is, whether, for the space of 600 yeres after christ, the people had their Cõmõ praiers i a stragetõge, ỹ they vnderstode not.

D. Hardinge, to make his owne purpose plaine, answereth with a distinction, that,

Hard. 72. *If M. Iewel meaneth by ỹ peoples Cõmõ Prayers, such as they made Comõly to God in priuate deuotion, he thinketh they vttered thẽ, in ỹ tõge which they vnderstode: but if he mean bi thẽ, ỹ publike seruice of ỹ Church (whereof the most part hath bene pronounced by the Bishops, Priests, Deacõs, & other Ecclesiasticall ministers) he graunteth ỹ some of the people vnderstode the langage therof, & some vnderstode it not.*

A distinction of common praiers.

And so vpõ this later point cõsisteth ỹ questiõ. Yet M. Iew. hath a quarel to ỹ former saying. This distinction of Common Prai-

ers, is both vnperfit and nedeles.

May, distinctions can neuer be nedelesse, where, some Reader, is like to be of small & plain vnderstãding, & wher, ỹ Aduersary is ful of words, ful of shifts, ful of digressions, ful of craking & vãtage making, ful of equiuocatiõs. For see but this one short exãple. D. Harding graunteth, ỹ Prayers in the Primitiue Church were in a known tõge. Hard. 94

M. Iew. layeth hold vpon ỹ word, & reporteth ỹ M. Hard. confesseth, that the Cõmõ praiers wer ꝓnoũced, in a cõmõ known tõge. 175 Falsely. Here therfor, wold not a distinctiõ do good ỹ of Praiers some be Cõmon, some be priuate & that D. Harding spake of priuate: but M. Iew. draweth it to Cõmõ Prayers? yet this is no great matter, (sauing for M. Iewels boldnes in additiõ) because D. harding wil in an other place, not refuse ỹ terme of Cõmõ praiers, but cõfesse ỹ they were, at ỹ beginning, in a Cõmõ tonge. But now if vpõ this graũt M. Iewel wil begin to triũph & say, althoug he haue wãtõli denied Christ, yet I trow, he wil not deni himself. And again M. Hard. cõfesseth that the cõmõ Praiers wer ꝓnoũced in a Cõmon known tõge. &c. Iew. 175 Now quite cõtrary, as a mã that had vtterli forgotte himself, he sayeth: The Cõmon seruice was neuer said, but either in the Greke tõge, or in

the latine. And againe (auouching it with his warrant verely) VERELy his ſainges can not ſtand both together.

After all theſe ſharp ſpitefull, glorious and bragging wordes, is not a diſtinction nedefull to declare ẏ truth of D. Hardings cauſe and meaning? For, Common Praiers may be vnderſtanded two waies First, that
1 praier, which is commonly made to God in priuate deuotion, is or may be called com-
2 mon. Secondly the publike Seruice of the Church beareth the name of Common praier. & of this we ſhall by and by ſpeake more. Concerning the firſt ſenſe, Common prayer was in a tongue knowen to the people, were they Iewes, Greks, Latines, Aphricans, Frenchmen or Engliſhmen. Cõcerning the ſecond it was in no other tongue, than Greke or Latine: & ſome vnderſtode it, ſome vnderſtode it not.

How think we then? was it not nedefull to put this diſtinction, in the very beginning of this Article? For by this meane, neither D. Harding hath vtterly forgottẽ himſelf, neither M. Iewell meanely remẽbred himſelf. The plain dealing of the one, is euidently defended, the blinde bragging of the other, is iuſtly abhorred. The lybertie of

One diſtinction diſcloſeth M. Iewels bragge.

making

making distinctions is with reason to be graunted, the licentiousnes in confounding of wordes and senses, is with conscience to be stopped. And now may D. harding confesse, that the Common Praiers (as they are distinct from Common Seruice) were sayd in a knowen tongue: neither can M. Iewell gather any speciall conclusion thereof, which quite ouerthroweth our whole purpose. Now for the other parte, if the foresayed distinction be vnperfite, doe yow then, M. Iewell, add somewhat vnto it: for take away from it yow can not well, as hauing two membres, and vnitie being indiuisibill. But what is the reason, where fore you mislike the distinction? Iew. 152.

For the secrete Praiers, that the faithful make seuerally by them selues, haue euer more ben called Priuate, and neuer Common. 152.

In dede as you vtter this matter, there appeereth no likelihode of cause, why the Secrete Prayers, which the faithful make seuerally by themselues, should be called Common. But add this one worde Commonly, (which D. Harding expresseth, and on which, the strength and consequence of his saieng resteth) and then, if your self can not

be ashamed of your craftines, yet other mai be warned, by ẏ exãple, to take hede of you. As The secrete praiers that the faithful made Cõmõly by thẽ selues be called Cõmõ. What absurdity in this? Or what vãtage to be takẽ against it? none surely at al. Yet because it stode not wᵗ your pride & cõtẽtiousnes, to let your aduersaries distinctiõ frely passe, wᵗout sõe dispoke, & iustli speke against it you could not, as he ꝓponed it: therfor ye made as though ye did not see ẏ place & force of ẏ word, (cõmõli) but quite leuing it out, ye infer your reply, as though D. Har. had saide,

Secrete Praiers be called Common.

But perchãce, though ye dissẽble ẏ word (cõmõly) yet your answer goth rightly against his mening. What ãswer is ẏ? Mary that the

Iew. 152. secret praiers of the faithfull, haue euermore bẽ called cõmõ & neuer priuate. What if thei haue ben alwais so cald? Is ẏ a good argumẽt in your cõsciẽce? Do ye not your selues vsurp, such ã authority & supremacy ouer al christẽdõ, ẏ ye dare both speak & do, ẏ cõtrary to ẏ, which hath bẽ euer more said & practised? for what if priuate praiers haue neuer ben called cõmõ? yet ẏ shall not let, but you wil at your plesure name thẽ so, whẽ you be disposed. And therfore D. Harding as it semeth to me, spake very warely, in referring

the matter to your meaning only, saying: *(If you mean M. Iew. by ẏ peoples cõmõ praiers. &c. Again: But if by ẏ cõmon praiers you mean ẏ publike seruice &c* As if he should say: M. Iewel hath ẏ vpper groũd aboue vs: what he denieth, ẏ must we proue: what he affirmeth, ẏ is wel proued &c & therfor I wil put this matter to his own meaning & make my distinctiõ accordingli. Byside this they may for some cause, continuing priuate, be called cõmõ although (which negatiue is very hard for you to proue) they were neuer heretofore so named. For in Englãd now at this presẽt, if one should say, *The Aue Maria is a Common Praier*, (as at rehersal wherof thousãds emõg ẏ people do list vp their mindes towardes God) though it be not cõmõly vsed in your publike seruice (for special & pure fear perchãce lest our Ladie should be to much remẽbred & Christ lesse regarded) yet doth he not speake truly & properly ẏ doth so say: you think not, I trust, ẏ it is a Salutatiõ & Praiers for holy dais only, or Church only, or Lords & Ladies only: & what fault thẽ is it in speache, when it is Cõmonly vsed, to call it a Cõmõ praier? I wil say more, not only Priuate praiers being cõmõly said mai be & are cald cõmõ praiers, & differ frõ publik seruice: bus

also those self same prayers, which are made openly, in the hearing and sight of other, & vnto which they answer Amē, are of an other sorte & kinde, thā the Cōmon prayer, as it is takē for publike Seruice. As, when the Apostles, in the cumpany of a hundred and twēty persons together, prayed, that God would shew, whether of the two, Joseph or Matthias, he would choose to take the place of ỹ ministery & Apostleship, frō which Judas the Traitour had falsely departed: was not that a Common prayer? yet cā you not proue (I beleue) that it was a parte of their Ordinary & Cōmon Seruice.

Act. 1.

Beside this also, when the Christiās met together in the Primitiue Church, among other gifts, which were plētifully thē geuē by the holyghost, ỹ gift of Prayer was one. That is, some one of the cūpany (and he not alwaies of the Clergy) graciously inspired, vttered in the audience of the rest, that forme or matter of Prayer, which the other should lerne and folow, being yet to seking how to doe by them selues. And this was in true speach a Cōmon prayer, yet was it not their Cōmon Seruice. For in publike Seruice, the Ecclesiastical ministers doe goe before & pronoūce it, but this was such

as

as lay men sometymes did vtter. Also in Publike Seruice the order is appointed and set, but in this case of which I speake, the Prayer was not knowen, before it was geauen: and they were not euery day sure of the geuing, the Holyghost alwaies disposing it by more or lesse, according to his blessed inspiration.

Seing therefore, that these kindes of Cõmon Prayers are so distincted, first in respect of the Cõmones of thẽ (though the vse be Priuate according to deuotiõ) Secondly for the open communicating of them according to ỹ Holyghosts inspiration, Thirdly because of the order & continuance of them, according to the Catholike Churchs law & cõstitution: why doth M. Iewel finde fault with distinctions, or that which is graunted to be true in the first and seconde, why will he haue it to be like in ỹ thirde kinde? And because the people vnderstode nõ they praied Priuately, or some other, what they vttered by the Holyghosts gift, spiritually, how can he conclude therefore, that the Cõmon Seruice was also in a tongue knowẽ vnto all the people vndoubtedly?

1

2

3

How cã he deny ỹ first? How doth he not cõsider ỹ second? How much abuseth he his

Aduersary

Aduersary and his Reader in the third?

For whiles he woulde haue it beleued, that Common Praier is no other thing to say, then Common Seruice of the Church: what so euer either Scriptures and auncient Fathers doe proue, concerning Common Praier, that it was in the Primitiue Churche in a knowen Tounge: that he draweth to Common Seruice of the Churche. And againste all forewarning, and distinction, and reason, he will triumphe therevpon, and crake, that it was euery where in a Tongue knowen to all the people.

Craft in double vnderstanding of a word.

For whiche cause this distinction is the better to be marked, least M. Iew. through his confusion, trouble the clerenesse of the matter.

Now therefore concerning the other part of D. Hardings distinction, in which he declareth vnto you, wherevpon he mindeth to ioyne with you in this third Article, what say yow therevnto? His wordes be plaine:

Hard. 72. *If you meane by Common praiers the Publike Seruice, some vnderstode it, and some vnderstode it not.*

Here

Here vnwares he implieth a repugnance in reason, and a manifest contradiction. Iew. 152

Whye so? may not both these propositions stand togeather?

When your selfe doe preache, M. Iewell, some, I beleue, vnderstande you not, and some vnderstand you: (for many stand a far of & some nerer vnto you) & some vnderstand not all fyne English, yet some vnderstand it well inough.

I will say, further. Your self I thinke, sometymes vnderstand your self, and some tymes ye doe not. Yet here is no necessitie of contradiction. For they nede not to be contrarye sayinges one to the other, in whiche sometymes ye knowe where ye be, some tymes ye speake, you can not tell what.

As, in the Declaming against the Sellinge and Byinge of Masses, you knowe what you speake: but in declaring of Christes Presence in the Sacrament, to be Reallye, Verely, Substantially, not by imagination &c. and yet by faith Onlye: M. Iewel himselfe vnderstandeth not M. Iewel. Yet, this is no Contradiction, neither shoulde that be the faulte, whiche I woulde therevppon, obiecte vnto you:

but

but this rather that ye goe about to destroy the Religion it selfe, because of the euill maners of them which professe it: or, that you, which haue no Masters worth the hearing whom ye can or dare name vnto vs, presume to teach the Catholike Church, Diuinitie.

How proue you then, a Contradiction to be implied herein, and a Contradiction of M. Hardings, where he saieth: Some vnderstode the Common Seruice, some vnderstode it not? For euen in England it selfe when the Latine Seruice was of late vsed, as it had continued hundreds of yeres together, it was true in lesser Cities by many degrees than London or Yorck: that some vnderstode it, some vnderstode it not: yet Latin is not so Common now in Englād, as it was, in ỹ Primitiue Church, through all these weast parts, where the Emperour of Rome had chiefe iurisdiction and gouernment.

But let vs consider, how M. Iewel proueth ỹ foresaied cõtradiction. For if some of the people vnderstode it not, how could alỹ people say Amen? Aske ye how? I will tell you. The ignorant sorte of the people, which for their lack of lerning, knew no

A worthie Reason. Iew. 152.

more

more than their owne tõgue, & yet for Charities sake at the least, should think the best of the Churches Seruice, they, when the lerned began, might ioyne to, their voices and declare by Amen, that they pray and wishe and assent, as their betters doe before them. And is this vnlikely or impossible? what shall we then thinke of ỹ Amen, which soundeth at Paules Crosse, when some famous and feruent Brother preacheth? Doth euery one that crieth Amen, heare his Prayer? And can ye reprone one for his good will, in helping forward to make the shoute greater, though he know not what the matter is: but only beleueth, that it is well saied, what soeuer that man of God vttereth? If there haue ben found emong your peuish Martyrs, which would dye, they knew not for what, but only that some one whom they loued, died before them: may not the faithfull people answer to the Ministers Amen, them selues vnderstanding not what was spoken, but trusting the others knowledge and Authoritie?

Againe, what necessitie that all the people should say, Amen? Or who maketh a

conclusion so generall? Surely not D. Harding. And therfore he for his part vttered no Contradiction. Who then? M. Iewell by likelihode will tell vs.

Iew. 152. S. Paules wordes be playne. How shal the vnlearned say Amen to thy thankes geuing? For he knoweth not, what thou saiest. This renneth directly against M. Harding. Al the people gaue their assent and said Amen &c.

How haue you proued, that All? By S. Paules words? First he hath not this word All. Thē you falsify him, because he should not make directly against your purposse. For his words are not, how shall the vnlearned say Amen. But how shal he that SVPPLIETH the PLACE of the Idiote and vnlearned say Amen? He speaketh not therfore generally: nor of al ỹ people? but, he noteth by special words sōe distinct persōs, which stode & answered in the place and stead of ỹ people. It is rather and trulier gathered by this place of S. Paule, (if you corrupt him not) ỹ all ỹ people did not answer Amē ordinarily: but ỹ others ther were appointed, to supply their place. And so may D. Harding repete his proposition again, (as he doth) & say wout reproch of cōtradictiō:

The Apostle falsified by M. Iewel.

I saye, that the Seruice was in a

tonge,

tonge, which some people vnderstode and some vnderstode not:

And M. Iewell in reprouing him for it hath done nothing els, but shewed his egernes and his feblenes.

But what meaneth D. Harding by it, *ỳ the Seruice was in a knowen tongue: which some people vnderstoode, and some vnderstode not?* whether intendeth he some subtiltie, and will play such a parte as M. Iewell often tymes doth, in hyding his purpose vnder ỳ generalitie of termes: that ye may not be sure wher to finde him? No truly. The thing it self doth testify the contrary. For concerning the, *Tongue I meane* (saieth he) *the Greke tongue and ỳ Latine tounge.* Harding. 77. Concerning those Some, which vnderstode it, he meaneth (as it is easy to be perceyued) *Lerned men, Gentilmen, Merchantes, al of liberal education.* Harding. 77. Concerning the other Some. which vnderstode it not, he meaneth, *al vplandishe people, Tillers of groũd, heardmẽ & womẽ.* Thus doth he deale plainly and

ſenſiblie, And not only that, but modeſtly alſo and quietly. I neuer read (ſaieth he) neither, I think, M. Iewel &c. that the Common ſeruice was in any other barbarous, and vulgare tongue within the ſix hundred yeres after Chriſt. And here, leaſt errour ſhould riſe, by miſtaking of termes: I cal (ſaieth he) *al tongues barbarous by-ſide the Hebrew, Greeke, and Latine.*

So that it may be well noted, that D. Harding ſeketh, by diſtincting of duble and doutfull woꝛdes, and by his naming of ẏ ſeſe on which he intẽdeth to reaſon, to haue the truth openly knowen, & ſhoꝛtly to haue ẏ queſtion perceyned. But M. Iewel woꝛketh by a contrary ſpꝛite, and as befoꝛe he miſliked with the diſtinction of Common Pꝛaiers: ſo now he is offended with the diſtinction of Tongues, where D. Harding placeth on the one ſide, Hebꝛew, Greke & Latine, and on the other, Barbarous and Vulgare tongues. Of whom he ſaieth.

M. Iewel lyketh not diſtinctions.

All

All other tounges byside Greeke and Latine he condemneth for Barbarous, by what authoritie I can not tell. Iew. 155

See the malice of the man, and of the word. He condemneth (you say) all other tounges for barbarous. wher find ye this? And if ye finde it not, how dare you affirme it, excepte by Authority, your self cannot tell what? Falshode in repeting of words.

I cal (saieth D. Harding) al tounges barbarous and Vulgar &c. Hard. 73.

And that ye might not gather thereof, that he spake so in reprothe and condemnation of any tounge, he putteth before the reason of it, saying:

To be the better vnderstanded, I cal all tounges barbarous &c.

He sowght not therefore to CONDEMNE any Tounge, but to declare, what he would meane by a Barbarous toũge. Neither maketh he himselfe a Controller and Iudge ouer other mens opinions herein: but an Interpretour of his owne. Yet doth M. Iewel so take him vp for ỹ matter, as thought this geare dyd sauor of heresye. And therfore like a Diuine) for confutation

thereof, he goeth to ỹ highest cause, that is God him selfe, saying:

For in respect of God there is neither Iew nor Gentile, nor Greeke, nor Barbarous.

If you aleage this as out of the Scripture (as it appeareth that ye doe by the quotation in the margine and by the distincte lettre in whiche it is printed) then must I tel you, that the Apostle nameth in deede Iewe and Greeke: but Gentile or Barbarous he nameth not, neither speaketh he of theyr diuersitie in tounges, but, in religion and affec. iõs. But if you allude onlye to that place, and by accommodation make a further meaning of it: let it be writen then, in the cursiue letter of your owne wordes, so much as is not expressely in the Scripture. Yet your saying is true, though your doing be suspitious, and it maketh to this purpose: that one shoulde not condemne an other: But, that one might not call an other after the proper name of the Countrye where hee was borne, thinke you that it is forbydden? Or is it againste the blessede and vniforme will and mynde of God, to call one Tounge Greeke, an other Latine: Or one pure and syne, an other ragged and Barbarous?

In

In respect of God, there is neyther Jew nor Gentile: ergo (you shall see a meruei-lous conclusion gathered out of Diuini-tye) who soeuer calleth some Jewes and some Gentiles, speaketh, by what Autho-ritie M. Jewel can not tell. Or els thus, In respect of God there is neyther Greeke nor Barbarous: Ergo who so calleth one a Greeke Tounge, an other Barbarous, speaketh, Master Iewel can not tell by what Authoritye.

Againe, In respecte of God, all is one: but in respecte of men are not some Tounges Eloquent, and other Barbarous? And doe not your selfe confesse, in thys very place, of whithe we speake, that S. Paule, makinge a full Diuision of the whole worlde, nameth some Greekes and some Barbarous? Yet in respecte of God there is neither Greke nor Barba-rous. Truly, if D. Hardinge woulde haue made this distinction of his owne heade only, you should not yet so curiously haue reproued hym for it, consideringe that he sayth no more but: *Ical tounges Barbarous &c.* And maketh no rule to the worlde, And that you haue his meaninge, thereby expressed vnto you.

M. Iew. forgetteth himselfe.

pa. 155.

But leaſt you thinke hym to be ſingular herein, you ſhall finde in Conradus Geſnerus (no Papiſte I warant you) that:

Conr. in ſuo Mithridatis

Barbaræ ſiue Barbaricæ linguæ, præter Græcam & Latinam, omnes dicuntur. Nos etiam Hebræam excipimus. All tounges are called Barbarous or barbaricall byſide the Greeke and Latine: but we alſo doe except the Hebrew tounge.

I note therefore this much, that you may conſider with what Spirite ye proceede: whiche will not ſuffer a Lerned man, to ſeperate by commodious diſtinction, the three moſte principal knowen and lerned Tounges, Hebrew, Greeke and Latine, from other baſer and Ruder tounges. And that you fetch a far of, ſuch a reaſō, to ouerthwart only his ſayinges as may ſerue againſte the Apoſtle himſelf, for calling ſome Greekes and ſome Barbarous.

Theſe thinges thus preſuppoſed, that Common Prayers and Common Seruice of the Church are not al one, and that ſome there were within the ſixe hundred after Chriſte,

Christ, which vnderstoode not the Publike Seruice, and, that all Tounges are Barbarous and Vulgare, byside Greeke and Latine: D. Harding begynneth to make argumentes for profe of his purpose.

Whereof it may be gathered, that hitherto he hath proued nothing. Iew. 159 How greedye.

Much better it might be gathered, that hitherto he hath made a plaine way to the matter, by putting aside suche doubtes, as might come in betweene through occasion of wordes mistaken and misunderstanden. what needeth therefore this brauerie? Or what meaneth this hastines? Or why triumpheth he, not only before the victorye, but also before battaile: wil not M. Iewel suffer a man to make a preface vnto his treatise, And speake some generall thinges pertcining to the question, before he make his principall argument against it: but he must shew furth his winninges (I can not tell what) and say: hereof it may be gathered, that he hath hitherto proued nothing? There is neither wit, nor Grauitie, nor Commoditie, in it, so to hall and put vnto him, out of no occasion, that which may sounde to disgracing of the Aduersary, and magnifyinge of his owne cause. But to the

pointe of the question.

The chiefe Argument that D. Harding maketh, is of one sorte, as if he should say: The inferiour Countries and Churches, folowed the same tounge in publike Seruice, which their Mother or Principall Church had: But those inferiour Churches had sundry and seuerall Languages: ergo the vulgar people of thē, could not vnderstand that general and vniforme tounge, of the Principall Church. This Argument he prosecuteth in order: firste by Example of the Greeke Church, then of the Latine: and, before he bringeth the Examples, he doth in both places signify, what he intendeth to proue, and by what meanes or Propositions he will proue it. And firste therefore these are to be considered, either because they serue to the openinge of the state of this question: either because it will be perceyued by them, what truste is to be geuen to M. Iewel: which so desperately (as I may say) doth put to and take away from D. Hardings words, ẏ to know his falsehoode and Craftines, it should be a good lesson, to such as lone their saluation.

D. Harding, before he sheweth particularly, what he can say of the Seruice in the

Greeke

Greeke Church, hath these wordes:

If I cã shew, ỹ the people of some countries of ỹ Greeke church which al had their praiers and Seruice in ỹ Greeke tounge, for ỹ more part vnderstode not the Greeke tounge: thẽ haue I proued, that I promised.

The principles out of which D. Harding will deduce his Conclusion, in the question of Publike Seruice.

In which sentence he declareth his intent and purpose, and sheweth what ỹ propositions are, which being proued, will serue that purpose. The first is this.

The people of some Countries of the Greeke church vnderstode not, for the more parte, the Greeke tounge. 1.

The seconde is. *Al the people of those countries had their Common praiers in the Greeke tounge.* 2.

This is ỹ most, ỹ any man cã peeke out of those words: except it be an other as M. Iewel is, which as he can make of nothing somewhat, so doth he make of somwhat al: for thus he gloseth vpon the text of D. Hardinges wordes.

Iew. 149.

Two propositõs M. Hardigh hath here chosẽ to proue. the one is that AL the greeke church,

More falshode of M. Iewels.

had the common Seruice, WHOLY and THOROVGHLY in the Greeke tounge.

Here first you lye, For in D. Hardinges sentence, these wordes, WHOLY and THOROVGHLY, are not founde at al: and the, WHICH AL, that you seeme to take as spoken of the whole Greeke Churche, is not thereto referred of D. Harding, but to the people only of those some Countries, which he mentioned the lyne before. And therfor as much difference as there is, betweene a Generall and a Speciall proposion, Or the people of al Greece, & Al the people of some Coutries of Greece: so greate and euident oddes there is, betweene true meaning and M. Iewels dealing. Nowe to the other proposition as M. Iewel reherseth it:

The other proposition is, That some whole Countries in the Grekee Church vnderstoode not the Greeke tounge.

Yet more craft.

Before, you were blamed for addinge, here now are you to be noted for taking away. But what is that? No smal thinge surely, nor such as may be spared: but those very wordes, which declare the truth and reasonablenesse of the proposition. For it is to absolute and vnlikely to say, Some whole

whole Countries of the Greeke Church vnderstoode not the Greeke tounge, but that, for the more parte, (which wordes M. Iewell suppressed), they vnderstode not the Greeke tongue, that will be true in theyr iudgement, which can consider, how many Simple, Rude, and Ignorant there are, in euery Country, which know no other then their vulgar tongue: And of the better sort, how many there are, which so know an other tounge beside their owne, that they are not much the wiser for it. You may see then how daungerous and sore a felow M. Iewel is.

Now concerning other two propositiõs (which M. Iewel hath with like Arte gathered out of D. Hardinges words, about the Latine tounge, as he hath done about the Greeke) to make his craft more sensyble, let D. Hardings own words be plainly set forthe.

Harding Fol. 79.

After that theese Countreys, (saith D. Harding speking of ỳ west church *had bene instructed in the Faithe, as thinges grewe to perfection, they had their*

their Seruice accordingly. No doubte such, as was vsed in the Churches, from whence their first Apostles and Preachers were sent. And because, the first Preachers of the Faithe came to these weast partes from Rome, directed some from S. Peter, some from S. Clement, some others afterwarde from other Bishoppes of that sea Apostolike: they planted and set vp in the Countries by them conuerted, the Seruice of the Church of Rome, or some other verye like, and that in the Latine Tounge onlye, for ought that can be shewed to the contrary.

Hereof may be gathered two Propositions.

1 Propositions seruing to the question of Publike Seruice.

The first, the weast Churches had suche Seruice, as was vsed in the Churches, from whence their first Apostles

The

and Preachers came.

The seconde, the firste planters of the Faithe came to these weast partes from Rome.

But, how doth M. Iewel conceiue these matters?

His proufe (sayeth he) for the Latine Seruice hangeth vpon two poyntes. The fyrste is, that all the Faithe of the weast parte of the worlde, came onlye from the Byshoppes of Rome.

First, you be deceiued in your numbring, because this is not the first, but the seconde Proposition by D. Hardinges accompte. Then, in that second of D. Hardinges, ye finde not these wordes, AL THE FAITH OF THE WEST: or these, CAME ONLY FROM ROME. For that had bene nothing else, but to geue you an occasion to slip away from the Principall question, and to enter into an endlesse & nedelesse talke, about, AL THE FAITH to come from, and to come ONLY from Rome. which because it was not geuen, therefore you make it to your self of your owne wit, And reason strongly in ỹ matter: ỹ the faith came not into these quarters, ONLY from Rome, be-

2 Iew. 167 M. Iew. busy in changing & shifting, and altering and adding.

Redieſſe proues, of M. Iew. and full of ghealſſes.

becauſe S. Paule planted the faith in England, and alſo Ioſeph of Aramathea, (as is ſurmiſed by the Brittiſhe Chronicles: And becauſe we (the welſhmen you meane) being your ſelfe borne in Deuonſheere) followed the Church of Grecia in keping of Eaſter, with ſuch other mighty Argumentes.

Thē, for the other part, that AL FAITH came not from Rome, ye preſſe vs ſore with Tertullians authority, that Hieruſalem was the mother and the Springe of Religion: as who ſhould thinke, that Iacob was not father of Ioſeph, becauſe Iacob himſelf was begoten of Iſaac: and that Rome could not be mother of the weaſt Churches, becauſe ſhe her ſelf had her Parents out of Hieruſalem: Or, as though D. Harding had ſtayed vpon the queſtion of AL FAITH, and that, ONLY from Rome, which at, all maketh no mention of, AL, or ONLy E: So looſely you haue behaued your ſelf in your firſt poynt. let vs now conſider your secōd.

Iew. 167 The ſeconde is, that the Planters of the ſame faith miniſtred the Common Seruyce EVERY WHERE IN THE LATINE TOVNGE.

This is the firſt of D. Hardinges Propoſitions, though M. Iewell make it the ſecond

second poynt: and in D. Hardinges words there is speciall mention neither of LATIN TOVNGE, neither of EVERY WHERE. But generally he sayed it, that suche *Seruice was in these west partes: as was vsed in the Churches from whence their first Apostles and preachers were sent.*

Whose chaunging and altering of M. Iew.

And this might stand, whether they came from Hierusalem, Greece or Rome. wherfore he specified nothing, vntill his seconde Proposition: where, out of this Principle, he gathereth, that because the faith came in to the weast from Rome, and they had the Latine Seruice: therefore, it should folowe by good reason, that it was also deliuered in Latine, where they planted the Christian Religion.

Consider now (indifferent Reader) how shamefully M. Iewel had disordered these matters. Of fower plaine and credible propositions, he hath made such a conueyaunce, by Adding: by Taking away: by making of Particulars General: by Drawing the Generall to special poynts: by Making that first which is second: by Promoting ỳ inferior vnto ỳ Superiors place: ỳ he hath left nothing as he found it, but, as it wer of

set

set purpose, labored to make confusion.

The sume of M. Iewels conueiaunce in foure Propositions onlye.

Al ỹ people of some countries had their seruice in Greke, saith D. Harding. He wil proue, saithe M. Iewel, that ALL the Greke Church had it WHOLY & THROVGHLY in the Greeke tounge.

Some whole Countries for ỹ more part vnderstode not Greke, quod D. Hard.

Some whole Countries vnderstoode not Greeke, quod M. Iewel by his gathering.

The faith came into the west from Rome, quod D. Harding.

Al the faith came only from Rome, sayeth M. Iewel vpon it.

The plãters of ỹ faith set vp, in the Coũtries by thẽ cõuerted, such Seruice as thẽ selues vsed quod D. Harding.

The planters of the same faith, (quod M. Iewel vpon it) ministred the Common seruice EVERY WHER in the LATIN tõge.

What miserable shifting and changing is this? what boldnesse in ventering? what Ordinary course in deceiuing? Yet this, in dede, is ỹ way to saue himself frõ taking, if he cã bring the questiõ to such a Generality: ỹ if he be driuen frõ one place, he mai flee to an other, to make ỹ aduersary weri of fo-

lowing, & the Reader weary of loking. For suppose, ỹ Latine Seruice were vsed in Aphrica, ỹ vulgar people not vnderstanding it, yet that is not EVERy WHER. Suppose it were vsed in Fraunce, yet neither ỹ proueth EVERy WHER. Come nearer home to England, and proue it to haue ben vsed there, yet very much lacketh of EVERy WHER. And so may M. Iewel like a bishop in deede not of Sarum but of the west Church, go frō Country to Country, in a straunge Visitation, & neuer make an end of Interrogatories & Inquisitiōs: vntil D. Harding shal satisfy his Lordship in al poynts, and proue ỹ EVERy WHERE IN THE WEST, the Seruice was ministred in ỹ Latine tounge. which thing I do not say, ỹ the Catholikes are not able to declare, (but be ỹ as it may be,) I note ỹ craft & cūning of M. Iew. which wold draw all things to such a generality or preciseneſſe of termes, ALL FAITH, ONLy FROM ROME, EVERy WHER. &c. and in any part alter, an other mannes Propositions.

Thus hauing declared what the chiefe Propositions were, whiche D. Hardinge thought vpon in this Controuersye, and which M. Iewel hath so hādled, as though no body would thinke vpon them: Let vs

now return to that Argument, in shewing of which, the most of this Article consisteth: And which, if it be proued accordingly, shal constrain M. Iewel to subscribe. which although it may be exemplified in both Churches, Greke & Latine, yet for so much as being ended in one, it may very easely be applied to the other, and also because I haue already bene to long in this Article: I will make it no further, then to ỹ Greke church: After this maner.

D. Hard. argumēt, against this thirde Article of M. Iew. Fol. 75.

The lesse Asia had the Seruice in the Greeke tounge:

But sundrye Countries of the same Asia vnderstode not the Greke tounge,

Ergo they had their Seruice in a tounge, which they vnderstode not.

Iew 160 Take heede good Reader (sayeth M. Iewell) Onlesse thou eie him wel, M. Harding wil steale from thee. Againe: Here is a faire glosse, but be not deceiued. M. Harding knoweth wel inough, it is but a fallacy, that is to say a deceitful argumēt, named in the scholes ex meris particularibus, or, A non distributo ad distributum. Onlesse he amend the Maior and make it an vniuersal and say thus: Al Asia the lesse had the Seruice in the Greke toūge.

Cons-

Concerning D. Hardinges knowlege, I beleue he putteth nothing in print, that he thinketh to be a fallacie. But why, is it a deceytfull Argument? Because it is named in Scholes, ex meris particularibus. Yet the Scholes, I trow, speak not of D. Hardinges argument, neither doe they condemne all Argumentes, which consiste of mere particulars. For the Syllogismus, named in Scholes expositorius, is of that making, and therefore your rule (M. Iewell) hath exceptions.

M. Iew. Logike more harder then that of the Scholes.

But you find fault with it an other way saying: Or, a non distributo ad distributum, as though it were to be suspected, that D. Harding (in sayeing, Asia the Lesse had the Seruice in the Greeke tounge) had meant to except some countries thereof: and that therfore it should be nede to bid him to put in Al, and amend the proposition. wheras, within six lines before, he doubted not to say (Al the Greeke Church had theyr Common Seruice in the Greeke tounge) to put you out of feare (M. Iewel) that he would not deny it of the lesse Asia being but a part of the Greeke Church, that which he graũted of the whole, & which also you specially marked.

Needlesse fear.

marked. How say you also to this argumẽt? Englád hath the Seruice in the Englisſh tõge, Wales the ſame Seruice that Englād hath: ergo Wales hath the Seruice in the Englisſh tõg.

Surely it ſeemeth good inough. And though ſome Protestant of other countreis, (thinking perchaunce that in the reformed Church of England, euery part thereof is prouided for, According to the diuerſitie of Rites and Tounges, as Innocẽtius hath by his vnderſtanding, decreed) though he (I ſay) would tel me, that it is a deceytful argument named in Scholes ex meris particularibus, or, a non diſtributo ad diſtributũ: Yet would I not chainge my minde, but think it ſtil a good reaſon, which I ſee proued ſo euidently to my face, by the practiſe and vſe of our country, that I can not deny the conſequence. Therfore perchaunce you are to ſcrupulous or to curious, M. Iewel in theſe ſchole points of which you ſpeake, or rather, if ỹ mater ſhuld be examined to ỹ vttermoſt, I think you wold be proued obliuious, or worthy to be ſet again to ſchole to lerne more Logik. But for ſhortnes ſake let ỹ Maior be reformed as you require, as

Al Aſia ỹ leſſe had ỹ cõmon ſeruice in the Greeke tounge,

But

But ſundry nations in Aſia the leſſe vnderſtode not the Greeke tounge:

Ergo ſundry natiõs in Aſia the leſſe vnderſtod not the Common Seruice.

The argument being now amended in ẏ point, for which only ye bid your Reader take heed and eie him wel, if both propoſitions may be proued, thẽ ſhal it behoue M. Iew. to ſubſcribe. Therfore, to the Maior and firſt of the two, what ſay you?

That Aſia the leſſe had the Seruice in greke, it is doubted of no mã, nor lernd nor vnlernd. Iew. 160

See, what a good wil can do? Now, whẽ you be diſpoſed, you are ſo fre, ẏ rather then fail, the vnlearned alſo ſhallbe ſuppoſed to know ẏ Aſia the leſſe had theyr Seruice in Greke: which yet, being vnlearned, know not what Aſia ẏ leſſe is, & much leſſe what tonge was there vſed, a M. yeres a go. For how ſhould they come to ẏ knowledge? by ſeing & hearing? they are not thẽ aliue now which ſo do know it. By reading & conſidering ẏ bokes & records of thoſe dayes? They are not thẽ vnlearned which can ſo doe. By geſſing it and gathering it by their own reaſon, or of an other mãs talke? That could not put thẽ out of doubt in ẏ matter. Bountefully.

That could not put them out of doubt in the matter. Yet sayeth M. Iewel, It is doubted of no man, nor learned nor vnlearned. It foloweth.

But that al Asia the lesse had throughout in al parts the same Seruice (why adde you) THROVGHOVT, In al partes, the same Seruice? This signifieth, that ye haue your termes and shiftes in a readinesse, if neede be. But goe ye forwarde.

Shifts in a readines

If it be denied, M. Hardinge with all his learning, is not hable to proue it.

But you, I trow, are able, and that may be perchaunce the cause, why you say, If it be denied. Sparinge, as it were for conscience sake, to deny that which may be proued: and yet taking that praise away frome your aduersary, that he should be able to doe it. But what shal we doe with your If? A greate sturre you haue kepte, in bidding the Reader take heede. And to eye D. Harding least he steale away, in examininge the argument, in amending the Maior: & now when it is, as you wisshed, and the proposition is full and vniuersall, you steale away in deede by an If, and can not be certainely eyed, whither ye goe or what ye intend. Yet, because the presumption is very good,

Contentions.

good, that you would not spare your aduersary, if opportunitie serued, or leese any vantage that might be taken: we may conceyue, that you permit ỹ Maior to stand as graunted. But yet againe, least hereafter you shuld driue him in your āger to proue it, and flatly then deny that, which now fauorably ye remit vnto him, signifying only by an If, the liberty which you haue to vse more rigour & extremity, but not following the vantage to the vttermosse: therefore will I tell you sumwhat before hand, how ỹ Maior shalbe proued, that you may well thinke vpon a direct answer.

I proue it by this consequence. All Asia the lesse was of the Greke church: Ergo they had ỹ Seruice in the Greeke Tounge.

The first proofe of ỹ Maior in the principall argument afore saide.

The consequence if you will doubt of it foloweth of that Rule, A definitione ad definitum. For after ye haue declared, what this word, Church meaneth, and founde, that it includeth without exception all the nūber of thē, which through ỹ whole world confesse & professe, one God one faith and one Obedience: after this, I say, when you come to ỹ particulars, and define vnto vs,

What the Greekes church is.

what ỹ Greke Church is: you shalbe constrained to meane ỹ society & cumpany of the faithful, whose publike Seruice is in ỹ Greeke tounge.

Iew. 164. The antecedēt I neade not proue, least M. Iewel should cal it vanitas vanitatum, & tel vs, ỹ it is not denied neither of learned nor vnlearned. And yet least he should interprete this my opiniō to be but for a shift and euasion, I will shew him good cause, 159. wherefore I take it. For, if M. Iewel find no fault with D. Harding, for compriſing within the name of the Greeke Church:

That coūtrie which properly is called Græcia, Macedonia, Thracia, Asia ỹ lesse & coūtries adioining, ỹ prouinces allotted to ỹ Patriarke of Alexandria in AEgypt and of Antiochia in Syria:

I can not searc, ỹ he wil be lesse indifferent and quiet towards me: which speak so much within my bounds, and mention no other Countries belonging to the Greeke Church, but only the lesse Asia.

Beside this, your selfe, M. Iewel, diuide the Church, not only into the Greeke and the Latine: but also in to the Churches of Æthiopia, Scythia, India, Arabia, Syria, Persia Media,

Media, Armenia, & a great number of other countries. In which part then of al these, is Asia the lesse? Not in the Latin Church, not in the cumpasse of Æthiopia, Scythia, India, Arabia, Syria, Persia, Media, Armenia or any other of ỹ great nũber of Countries which you signify. If it be in any, name it vnto vs, & shew your Authority: ỹ and if it be not (as in dede it is manifest by ỹ borders whiche learned and experte wryters doe note to be attributed and made vnto them) then muste all Asia the lesse be of the Greke Churche.

And again, if throughout al ỹ lesse Asia, ỹ Publike Seruice had not ben in one cõmon and currant Greke, it must haue folowed, ỹ according to ỹ diuersity of tounges & cõtries therof, a distinct interpretation of the Scriptures, was also prouided for thẽ. For the Publike Seruice consisteth chiefly of the Scriptures, as the proper bookes of Christians (whiche are to be, either instructed, or furthered, or perfited in the lawe of God) and as moste proper for that place, where all Prophane thinges sette a syde, the Diuine Hystoryes, Psalmes, Gospels and Lessõs are to be rehersed & cõsidered, will M. Iewel deny this?

M. Iew. a falsifier of coūcels. 153.

how can he? which is so redye to graunt it, that he lieth two Councels (of Laodicea and of Carthage) sayeing them to haue decreede, that nothing must be redde in the Church to the people, sauing only the Canonicall Scriptures. Yet the Councel is not so, but, in prouiding that no other bookes should be red there, as in the name of Scriptures, but onlye the Canonicall Scriptures, it declareth, what a singular estimation and vse of them was in the Common Seruice of the Church.

This Seruice then, consisting chiefly of Scriptures, must not the people vnderstande it? By M. Jewels Diuinitie they muste. Ergo the tounges, in which the Scriptures were then writen, should be knowen vnto them. And to bring this to passe, looke how many seueral Countries were in the lesse Asia: so many interpretacions of the Scriptures were made correspondent vnto them. But what shal we nowe saye? For manye skore yeres after Christ there was in all the world but one Greeke interpretation of the Scriptures, and that was made by seauentie Elders of ꝑ Jewes in ꝑ tyme of Ptolomeus Philadelphus. After which, there folowed six interpreta-

Of the interpretation of scriptures into Greeke.

pretations: the first of Aquila, the second of Symmachus, ỹ third of Theodotio, ỹ fourth had no certaine Author, and was founde in Hiericho. The fift, was (without Authors name) found in Nicopolis. The sixte, was made by Lucianus the Heremite and Martyr, and found in a tower of Nicomedia. Euthymius in præfatione in Psalmos.

Consider now by this, indifferent Reader, how litle store and copy of Interpretations of Scriptures, was then, when of vij. only so great accompt is made: And howe litle haste was made to set them abrode, which were so kept in by the Authors: and howe great price was then made of them, the finding of which is so singularly noted.

But let vs staye our selues vpon those first yeres, in which there was no other interpretation of the Scriptures in ỹ Greeke Tounge, but that of the Septuagintes.

In this case then, did all Churches of Asia the lesse, vse that Interpretation? They must haue vsed it, or else haue none.

Did all vnderstand it? How is it possible, the seuerall Countries and Tounges in Asia the lesse, being at the least. xiij. in number. Forth then: had some Churches no Seruice at all, because they vnderstode not the Greeke of the Septuagintes? Or

had

Here let M. Iew. shew hys knowledge.

Or had they such Seruice, in whiche no Scripture was read? Either ye must admit this absurdity, either ye must hold your peace (M. Iewel) for lacke of answer, either ye must subscribe and yelde to the Catholikes. For, if the Scriptures were then in no other Greeke tounge, then that of the Septuagintes: And if the vulgar people of diuers Countries and Languages in the lesse Asia vnderstode not that Greeke: And if without the Scriptures, the Publike Seruice be not made: either the Seruice was in that tounge which all the Vulgare people of the lesse Asia did not vnderstand, (and then you must subscribe) Or else in some Churches they had no Seruice, because they had no Scriptures turned into the Vulgare tounge, (which is most absurde and vnreasonable) Or else you muste secretely confesse it, that you can not fynde, what tounge they vsed in their Seruice, or what you may answer to this Argument.

The. iii. proue.

Thirdly I proue the Maior, by an Induction.

In Smyrna, in Pontus, in Cappadocia, in Lycaonia, in Caria or Thracia, et Sic de singulis, and so in eche other

Coun-

Countrey of the leſſe Aſia the Seruice was in the Greeke tounge:

Ergo (the Maior foloweth,) that all the leſſe Aſia had their Seruice in the Greeke tounge.

The Induction is good and lawfull, as conſiſting of a ſufficient Enumeration of particular Countries in the leſſe Aſia, with Importing, or Supplying, or Making good, the reſt vnrehersed, by this clauſe, Et ſic de ſingulis, and ſo in eche of the reſt.

The Antecedent I proue, concerning thoſe Countries which I named. And I proue it by your warrant (M. Iewel) becauſe it is ſureſt. Verily, ſay you, Polycarpus was Bishop of Smyrna, Gregorius Bishop of Pontus, S. Baſil was Bishop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, Amphilochius B. of Iconium in Lycaonia, Gregorius S. Baſiles brother B. of Nyſſa in Caria or Thracia after your reckoning: All theſe in ſondrye Countries in Aſia preached openlye in the Greeke tonge, and the vulgar people vnderſtode thē. Iew. 161.

I take your Confeſſion, and proue there by, in your Iudgemente, and euerye other Proteſtantes, that the Seruice alſo was in the Greeke tounge in thoſe Countreis: except

except you would answer, that they preached in the Greeke and knowen Tounge, but ministred in an other then Greeke or knowen. And herein I vse the vauntage of your graunt, to proue that the Seruice was in Greeke: but that it was knowen vnto all ỹ Vulgare people, therin we agree not wᵗ you. Yea ỹ very Sermõs & Treatises of S. Basile, Gregory Nazianzene and Gregory Nissine, as they are nowe extant, were not surely vnderstanded of the Common people of those Countries, wher they sate Bishops: but were pronounced, to the capacity of the vulgare audience, in termes most familiar and knowen, and afterwards penned in the learned Tounge, as well for other Nations as their owne Countries. For the Seruice being wryten in the Common Greeke, as appereth by S. Basiles Liturgie or Masse, and their bokes also keping the same Tounge: it is impossible, by common reason, that the Vulgare people of Cappadocia, Põtus and Caria should vnderstand it, whose language shalbe straitewaies proued (in declaring of the Minor proposition) to haue bene either Barbarous, that is no Greeke at all: either so corrupt and vncleane Greeke, that in compa-

rison

rison of the Tounges, vsed in the foresayde Liturgie or Sermons, they were (at the least) as far to seking, what was saide: as a vulgare Italian or Frenchman is, when he heareth a Latine Oration.

Concerning nowe the other Countreis which I haue not named, you can not require it of me, to goe particularly throughe them: but your part is to geue an Instance and to name any one, that had not the Seruice in the Greeke tounge: vntill whiche time the Maior standeth in good force, and may well be vsed of vs for certaine, whiche can not suspect the contrary. Now therfore let vs come to the Minor proposition.

Sundry Nations (saithe D. Harding) in Asia the lesse vnderstode not the Greeke. Harding Fol. 75.

But to what end? for neither this is denied by any of vs, nor is it any part of the questiō. Iew. 160

If ye deny it not, then foloweth the Cōclusion, that sundry Nations in Asia the lesse vnderstode not the Common Seruice: and so the end is, that you must subscribe. If it be no part of the question, how coulde you by force therof, be driuen to yeld? But consider what foloweth. Subscribe

And

Iew. 160 And yet notwithstanding, is not M. Harding able to proue it with all his gheasses.

what a stomake? Loe, he confesseth the Proposition to be true, and yet (so contentious he is) he will stand against D. Harding, that he is not able to proue it. Which stomake being once taken, what foule shifts will not a man inuent, rather then he wil take a double foile: The one, in yelding vnto his Aduersarye, the other in not defending that, whiche he toke vpon him to say. But for so muche as M. Iewel is so set, let vs proue the Minor, and consider his Answer therevnto.

Sundry Countries of Asia the lesse vnderstode not the learned Greeke? The Minor is thus declared by ẏ Actes of the Apostles.

The inhabitors of Cappadocia and Pamphilia are within Asia the lesse, and eche of them had a distinct and peculiar language. For S. Luke reporteth, as of others so also of these, ẏ when the Apostles begā to speak in diuers tounges, they were astonied and

Act. 2. wondered at ẏ matter, saying: A see, are not all these that speak, men of Galilee? and how doth euery one of vs, heare oure Tounge, in which we were borne? The Lycaonians also

Act. 14. are of Asia the lesse. And S. Luke noteth, that the people of Lystris spake Lycaonicè, that is, after the proper and peculiar tonge

of

of the Countrey of Lycaonia, wherof Listris was one of the Cities. Ergo, sundry countries of Asia the lesse vnderstode not the Greke. what answereth M. Iewel? Mary to the first of these two authorities he saith:

What if answer be made, that all these rehearsed in the Actes of the Apostles were not diuers Tounges: but rather certain differencies in one Tounge? Iew. 160.

Yet more what ifs? And are ye not yet at a poynt, to answer directly neither to Maior nor to Minor, but, that in both you must hange vpon Ifs? Here may we see, what a spite can do. He said that M. Harding is not able to proue his Minor (which he saide to try maistries) and now rather thē he will seme not to abide by his worde, he neither wil holde his Tounge, nor yet speake anye thing to the purpose: but by a what if, he prouideth that if he be taken tardy, he may not leese all, but say, I affirmed nothynge, but only put forth a case: and if no man reproue him, that then, his What if, may stād for a perfite Resolution. Contentious striuing, & striuing of M. Iewel.

But let vs consider your saying better. What if answere be made. &c. as before. Mary without peraduenture, it will be an idle answer and to no effect.

For,

For, to let it passe that S. Luke expressely sayeth, Euery one *hearde them speake Lingua sua, in his owne Tounge*, and to graunt vnto you, that all the teungs mentioned in the Actes, were not diuers, but that some were distincted from other, only by certaine differencies: Yet those differences were so great, that the Vulgare people of one Tounge, vnderstode not them of an other: For (I trust) you meane not such differencies, as are made by reason of Swiftnesse, Slownesse, Smothnesse or Hardnesse, and so furthe of Tounges: but such only as cõsist in the variety of Letters, Wordes and Dialect. In which respect, though the Tounge of Saxonie, Flanders, England and Scotland be one: yet because of a peculiar Property and Dialect whiche is in them, the Vulgar Saxons are not only Strangers to Englishe men, but allso to the Flemminges their neighbors: and the Vulgare Scottesman not only vnderstandeth not the Flemming, but of the Sowtherland so nigh vnto him, he knoweth not the wordes and meaning.

There be about three score seueral Coũtries, that vse the Tounge named Illyrica, but

but though the kind of the Tounge be one, and the difference consiste in Dialecte and proprietie only: yet they vnderstand not one the other, as in example: Hungarians, Moscouites, Polonians, Sclauons, Bohemians, & cæt. Gesnerus in Mithridate.

Also, if you wil conclude vpon this, because the kinde of tounge was one, of some of them which are rehersed in the Actes of the Apostles, that therfore, they vnderstode one the other: what miracle call you this to make men astonied at: And that Cappadocians and Bythinians, hearing the Apostles speaking vnto them in their owne Tounge, vnderstoode them both at once: Or howe could S. Luke so forget himselfe, that to commend and set furth the greate worke and gifte of God shewed by ỹ tounges of the Apostles, he would make a great matter of it, and say, that: *the inhabitants of Pōtus, Cappadocia, Phrygia, Pamphilia, & Asia wer amased & astonied asking: how do we euery one of vs here our tounge, in which we were borne?* if in deede these had one naturall tounge, & vnderstode one an other, sauinge for certeine

tein odd differences. Cartainly if ẏ difference were smal, the miracle must needs be smal, which S. Luke telleth for greate.

If an English man, knowing no other tounge byside his owne, and a welshman, of ẏ like knowledge in his naturall tounge only, shoulde come together to Diuinitye Schole in Oxforde, and both of them vnderstād ẏ Kinges Reader, this were much to be wondred at: but if there come to Paules Crosse, out of eche Sheer in England, seueral persons, and vnderstand the Preachers English, doe they loke one vpon an other for it? do they wōder at the working spirite in him, and say: howe doe we heare, euery one of vs, this fellowe, whiche is borne an English man, to speake our Vulgar tounge? Yet no doubt there is a difference of speache, betwen English men of diuers Sheers. But it is not so great, as to make a miracle when they, Englishe men borne, vnderstand the self same tounge in an English Preacher.

Now, that in the Actes of the Apostles was a wonderfull Strainge and Diuine matter. and ẏ grace and strength of it consisted herein, that they (whom for ẏ purpose S. Luke rekeneth vp) vnderstoode at one tyme

tyme, a third person speakinge vnto them, & could not yet vnderstand eche the other, speaking together. wherefore you may as wel confesse, M. Jewel, ỳ al there expressed had a diuers language: as ỳ some had, but a certaine differēce only frō other, therein. Because, ỳ difference helpeth you so litle, that we proue thereby ỳ tounge of Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, to haue bene so muche distincte one frome ỳ other: that the Common & learned Greeke tounge, which was vsed in the Churches of those selfsame coūtries, could not be vnderstāded of euery vulgar mā womā & child, of those coūtries.

M. Jew. what it helpeth nothing.

But let vs consider M. Jewels answer, to the other Authority of the Actes of the Apostles, that we may al vnder one cōfute his oft repeted Iffinge and shiftinge. To that of the Lycaonians thus he sayeth:

The people of Lycaonia spake vnto Paule and Barnabas Lycaonicè: Ergo, saieth M. Harding, they spake no Greeke. Jew. 164

This is one cōmon trik, of your Logike, to peruerte and alter the intent of your aduersary. D. Hardings cōclusiō wil be this: Ergo they vnderstod not the learned Greeke tounge: for to this purpose he allegeth all his Authorities.

A commō tricke of M. Jew.

Therefore, whether they spake Greeke or no, that is not the mater: but whether they spake or vnderstoode suche Greeke, as the Scriptures and Church Seruice were then conteyned in, Or such as we reade now in the workes and Liturgies of S. Basile, Gregorie Nazianzene, or Chrysostome. Consider therfore (M. Jewel) how properly ye procede and argue.

But what if S. Luke had saied, they spake Ionicè, Æolicè, or Doricè, which tounges were adioyning fast vpon Lycaonia. would he therfore conclude they spake no Greeke?

Iew. 164

Here loe is a what if, to further the cause. But what seke you by it, M. Jewel? Suppose, goe to, that S. Luke, in place of Lycaonicè, had writen Ionicè, what then? would he therfore (say you of M. Harding) cõclude they spake no Greeke? No forsoth: for he sought not after ỹ cõclusiõ. And Alas therfore (to take more iust pity of you then you can doe of others) here hath M. Jewell loste a good Argument.

M. Iew. much deceyued in his aumig

Againe, he knoweth, that the Greeke tounge is diuided by the learned therein, into fyue Dialectes: of which Ionica, Æolica, and Dorica, are three, and therefore he speaketh Greeke that speaketh in them, but we haue

haue no ſuch warrant for the Lycaonicall Tounge.

Thirdly he might conclude, ỹ al though they ſpake Greeke, yet not that which is Attica or the pure and Common Greeke tounge: in which two the Scriptures, and old Fathers writings, are ſet furth.

But what talke you of that, whiche S. Luke might haue ſayed, and do not anſwer to that, which he hath writen? Theſe toun-(ges ſay you, meaning Ionica, Aeolica Do-rica) were adioyning faſt vpon Lycaonia. I finde no fault with your Coſmographie, but I ſee not, what end ye bringe it to. For Spaine is adioyning faſte vppon France, yet Spaniſh and French, are two ſundry languages. And Lycaonia though it ſhould ſtand in the myddeſt of Ionium or Aeolia, it needeth not yet, forget it ſelfe and beeome Ionical or Aeolical.

An Idle reaſon or talke of M. Iew.

Verely (ſay you) if a man by way of contention would ſay, the Lycaonical tounge was a Corruption or differẽce of the greeke tonge and not a ſeueral tounge of it ſelf (M. Harding ſhould haue much a do to proue the cõtrary.

So ſhould he, to proue that S. Peter was euer at Rome. For what is ſo plaine or teſtified, that a Contentious felow can not ſay

or ſuppoſe ſomewhat, againſt it. But this way (one would think) you folow not your ſelfe, and therfore you goe warely and wiſely forward, with Verely if a man & cæt. Yet ye ſeeme to take, as it were, ſome cumfort of it: that M. Harding ſhuld haue much adoe with a wrangler, if one would cõtend with him. And ſodainly your ſelfe begyn to play that part in proving, that the Lycaonians ſhould ſpeake Greeke, ſaying:

Here is to be learned how one might go in the way of contention. But M. Iew. doth as appeareth by his confeſſed, If a man &c.

Doubtleſſe they whorſhipped Iupiter: And they had the Greeke Sacrifice as it appeareth by the wordes of S. Luke, And it may be credibly gathered that Paule and Barnabas ſpake to them in Greeke.

Doubtleſſe you haue well declared and pithily, what a man would ſay, by way of Contention. Otherwiſe, ye might by theſe reaſons proue that ꝑ Romanes alſo ſpake, after a certaine corrupte kinde of Greeke, becauſe they worſhipped Iupiter the God of the Greekes: And had Greeke Sacrifice alſo, as much as they of Lycaonia, & becauſe S. Paule wrote to thẽ in Greeke. &, as it may be credibly gathered, ſpake alſo vnto them in Greeke.

Alex. ab Alexand Genial. dier, li. 6

Howebeit (ſay you) whether it were ſo or otherwiſe, it importeth nothing (why then reaſon you ſo mightely about it) ſauing that

M. Harding maketh the matter so certaine.

I perceyue then it is one of your cares, how to ouerthwart D. Harding: And, sauinge that he sayeth it, otherwise you care not to graunt, that the Lycaonians had a seuerall tounge by them selues. For whether it were so or otherwise, it inporteth nothing, you say. Yet neither this, is true, ỹ you say: Because, it importeth both ways.

A Greate harte, and set to resist

For if their tounge were a corrupt Greke (as ỹ Italiã or Spanish is a corrupt Latin) thẽ did they not vnderstãd psalmes & chapiters of Scripture in their Seruice, which were trãslated into true & cleane Greke only. And if they had a seuerall Tounge by thẽ selues, much lesse thẽ, did they vnderstand, what was sayed in the Church.

The question also, is not herein whether, they spake greeke or no: but whether they vnderstode the learned Greek or no. To ỹ vnderstãding therefore, al is to be referred. And whereas we see by experience at these dayes, that euery Englishman vnderstandeth not ỹ Scot, nor ỹ lower countries that speak Duch, vnderstand the hygh Almanes (which yet differ but in Dialect) why shuld we think, ỹ euery one in Asia ỹ spake greke, vnderstode also the proper & pure Greeke?

For the pure Greeke, which holy Fathers haue writen, and in which the Scriptures be preserued, is compriſed within a ſmall cumpaſſe of Countries, and continueth after one maner ſtill: but the Corrupte and Barbarous Greeke extendeth it ſelfe farre and wide, and is, by ſundry occaſions, altered, euery day, wandring further and further of, from the likeneſſe and vicinitie to the cleane and Learned Greeke. And therfore, Ioannes Grammaticus writing purpoſly of ꝑ Greeke Dialectes, him ſelf being a Greeke writer, ſayeth, that if ye will take into the number, ꝑ Dialect called Cómunis: then are there fyue of them, Ionica, Attica, Dorica, Aeolica, Communis. But the barbarous Dialectes (ſayeth he) being of great number and far out of reache, it is not eaſy to declare. ἄλλως τε οὐδὲ λεκτέον αὐτας διαλέκτους, ἀλλὰ γλωττας.

Yea rather we muſte not call them Dialects, but tounges. So vnlike they were to other Greke Tounges, not only the Common but alſo ꝑ peculiare fower Dialectes.

So that if the Lycaonians had a Seuerall tounge, vtterly diſtincted from Greeke, ſo muchwilbe imported therby: ꝑ al vnderſtod not ꝑ greeke Seruice, norꝑ ꝑ Sermõs of Am-

of Amphilochius, or any other Bishop ther if they spake, as they wryte. And if on the other side, they spake Greeke, but yet corruptly & barbarously, that it selfe importeth so much, that they vnderstode not their seruice, whiche was wrytten in the learned Greeke. And as I haue said now for Lycaonia, so may I reason of Cappadocia, Pōtus, Thracia, and proue that whether the people of that Country spake Greeke or otherwise: yet vndoubtedly they vnderstode not (all of them) the Greeke of the Church Seruice.

Wherfore the Maior being presupposed as euident, *that all Asia the lesse had the Seruice in Greeke,* (vntil M. Iewel bring an instance) and M. Iewel helpinge forward to the prouing of it by his graunt, that these Countries within it, Smyrna, Pōtus, Cappadocia, Lycaonia, Caria, had their Sermons and (by consequence) Seruice in Greeke: The Minor being also abundātly proued by D. Harding, and by me sufficiētly declared, that sundrye Countries in Asia the lesse vnderstode not the learned Greeke. The Conclusion foloweth, ẏ some Countries had the Seruice in that tounge, which

was

was vnknowen and straunge vnto them, and that Master Iewell muste yelde and subscribe. And thus muche concerning the Greeke Church.

To speake now of the Latin Church, and to prosequute the forsayed argument by it also, I think it nedlesse. Either because that which hath ben spokē of ẏ Greeke Church, ẏ it had ẏ publike Seruice in ẏ greeke tōge, may easely be applied to ẏ Latin Church, to proue the Latin Seruice there (which once admitted, M. Iewel will not deny, but that sundry Countries of the same Church vnderstoode not Latine, nor had it as their Vulgare tounge, wherevpon his yelding must folow) either because my intent is, not to speake so much, as the matter geaueth occasion, but shortly to comprehend the Some of that whiche is done: Either because the Aduersary will be so vnable and impotent to answer that which allreadye is sayed: that, to trouble hym with more, were loste labor. I maye also moste iustlye saye it, that he is so wilfully disposed and sette, not to yelde, and hath so many wayes, throughe muche Practise of his owne, and helpe of other Subtile Heades, To Dissemble the righte Obiections, To

make

make longe Answers to Thinges that were not moued, To Extenuate Authorityes alleaged, To bringe all thynges into playne doubte, or Suspition thereof: that nothinge shall be broughe whiche he will not denye, except it be very sensible.

For whiche cause, it had not bene euill, neuer to haue mentioned, so muche as I haue done of D. Hardinges Argumentes, but, by a more compendious waye, to haue lefte them passe by, in silence, and to haue stayed in the myddle of this Article, where, I lefte Master Iewell, without anye good Argumente or Lykelyhoode for his Assertion, Requiringe hym to shewe, what sure Euidencies, he or his Fryndes could bringe furth, in the cause.

Yet for so muche as I spared not to declare also, howe D. Hardinge hath reasoned, nowe it remayneth, not only to consyder his Argumentes, but also to compare them: that is, not onlye to attend and marke what strength they haue by thē selues, but also how much more force & certayntie they haue in respecte of M. Iewels

wels surmises. Consider it by it selfe and say:

The Latin Church is therfore called Latine, because of the tounge which is cõmon and currant through it.

Againe, in all Italy at the least, the Seruice was in true Latine, but vndoubtedly the vulgare speache of the whole Countrye was not pure Latine.

Againe: If there had bene in the weast Church any other Tounge then Latine, it could not, but by some token be apparent and euident, and some fragmentes or portions, of the Seruice in the Vulgar tounge would haue bene preserued, if by no other meanes, yet by History.

Consider I saye these thinges in them selues, and it may become a right good and wise man, not to mistrust, at this present, the vse of the Latine Tounge in Publike Seruice, which he maye by so good reason gather to haue bene vsed at the beginning in suche Churches, where they that were present, vnderstode it not. But compare nowe with this, that on the other syde which M. Iewel alleageth, that in Olde time they had in their prayers, al, as it were one voyce and one minde: and, that al seueral

Iew. 176

nations

nations praied vnto God and praised him in their owne natural and Mother tounge: and, That watchinges, Praiers and Common Psalmodie, was in estimation in sundrie countries, and, That Christe is nowe the voice of the whole world: Compare, I say, these allegations with the Authorities of D. Harding, and thou shalt fynde, that the odds is so greate, that in these of M. Iewels there is no Testimonye or Reason at all, for Publike Seruice. Yet if this shal not seeme so to his Fauorers, and if they wil needes defende it, that M. Iewel hath spoken like a Greate Clerke to no litle purpose, maie it please them, to intreate him to satisfie vs a litle more, ỳ we may vnderstand but of our owne Countrie (to troble him with no other) when the Englishe Seruice ceased, and when the Latine began.

And if he shal neuer be able to bring any Token or Argument, that euer it was in any other Tounge then Latine, sauing of late in King Edward the vj. dayes, can it with any conscience be required of a Catholike, to forsake that Order of which the Aduersary, with all his Serche or Curiositie, can geue no other begynninge, but from the founders of our Christian faithe in Eng- Reasonable.

in England? Or will he enforce vs to subscribe to his newly inuented manner of Seruice, which neither we, nor he, did euer Reade or heare, that it was vsed in any tyme these fiuetene hundred yeres?

All other Argumentes maye be letts passe, This one of Tradition beinge so a- Traditiō uaileable and sufficient, that, excepte we would of set purpose and againste all conscience folow new deuises and inuentions, we ought not to forsake the Auncient and receaued Order in Seruice.

And therefore to the ouerthrowing of this third Article, and strieng of a faithfull and Catholike harte, let it be answered to all busie peekers of quarels about other mens right: I holde the Latine Seruice by Tradition, I beleue it came frome the first planters of the faith in our countrie. If I be deceaued, tell me, frome whome els, And whē, And how, I receaued it? And shew, by whome, when, And how, the Englishe Seruice was firste receaued, and afterwardes how it decaied?

And if thou canst not in these two poyntes, neither speake againste the firste, nor shewe for the second: hold thy peace then like a wise man, and blame not them which holde

holde aduisedly the Latine Seruice, because
they haue receaued it, And will not yeld
rashly to ỹ chainging of it into
Englishe, because no Ex
ample maketh for it.

The fourthe Article

(***)

Whether the Biſshope of Rome was, within ſix hundred yeres after Chriſte, called an Vniuerſall Biſshope and head of the Church.

By what name ſoeuer, the B. of Rome was then called, if it be plainly proued, that his Supreme power and Authoritie ouer the whole Churche, was then acknowledged and cõfeſſed: there is no more to be required or ſought for in this Article. Is not this true? And ſhall not euery quiet & reaſonable man, be contented herewithal? Yes verely. Except we would be brought to that folly, we muſte not paſſe vppon the thinges themſelues, but ſeeke only after the names of them: And diſcredit the Truth of the matter, for lacke of finding the worde whiche betokeneth it. Will it pleaſe then M. Iewel. to be contented and anſwered, if we proue to him the Popes Supreme Authoritie ouer the Church: though we alleage not the very termes of Vniuerſal Biſshope or head, which he aſketh for.

I would

I would some indifferēt man would perswade with him, to remit somewhat of ẏ rigor of his, and extreme hard dealing, that if the Thinge it selfe be found, & the Terme of it to seekinge, yet, he obey the approued Authoritie and confound not al order for lacke of significant wordes to expresse it by. Yet, he shall haue Termes significāt enough: as Principalitie, Primacie, Chiefe Rule, and such others, as the Fathers vse, in speakinge of the See of Rome. Mary, for those two which he requireth, he must not be to hasty vpon vs, consideringe, that it is not the word that maketh a Thinge, but the wil of God or act of man. And againe, that one Thinge may, by sundrie wayes of like force, be expressed, ẏ if some one lacke, some other may supply it.

A reasonable request.

Lyke as therefore in cominge to some one place, that hath many wayes leadinge thither, he, should lacke either his sight or his reason, which would wrangle and contend with me, that I am not there, because I knowe not, or folowed not, that way which he would haue taken, & yet I chose (I trow) a good way enough, which brought me directly to my purpose: So in ẏ seeking out of the Truth which is in the thinges

themselues, vnto which we are conducted many wayes by varietie and copie of wordes, he that could not deny it me, but that I haue the Matter I sought for, and yet would aske me where is the speciall word, Head of the Church which signifieth the Popes Supremicie, doth by al reason declare, not, that I am far from my purpose, but that him selfe is desirous to peeke quarels and seeke digressions.

Let vs be iudged then with tolerable indifferẽcie. Hath not D. Hardinge folowed a reasonable and allowable order, which, in this question of the Supremicie, proueth the Thinge it selfe, and counteth it of no greate importance, to seeke for the speciall wordes which M. Iew. requireth? Is not so much enough for a quiet Reader? And ẏ end beinge attained vnto, haue we to goe any further? I could proue no. But I do not mistrust, so little Iudgment or Conscience, to be in honest natures. And first therfore I desire this, wel to be remẽbred & noted, ẏ ẏ heretike hath no vãtage against ẏ Catholike, for his goinge to ẏ matter, and passinge ouer Names, & Titles, & wordes.

Secondly it foloweth to be marked well, that D. Harding (not, because ẏ question it selfe,

selfe required it of necessitie, but, for that he would satisfie to the vttermost M. Iewels, or some others, curiositie) he sheweth out of good authoritie the very selfe names which M. Iewel requireth: (Vniuersall bishop & Head of the Church,) to haue ben spoken of the B. of Rome, within the compasse of the six hundred yeares after Christ. But marke it (I pray thee good Reader) perfitely, that by the conferringe of person with person, Behauior with behauior, Chalenger with defender, and Aunswer with Argument, the triflinge or earnest dealinge may the better appeare, the more nigh these contraries, be in sight the one of the other.

Now then in the third place, consider, how vnreasonably M. Iew. craketh, in this Article, against him, which by all right was not bound to Names, and Titles, prouinge the Thinges them selues, and which afterward, brought furth the very Names so much asked for: least perchaunce by M. Iewels triumphinge there vpon, many should certainely beleue, we had lost ẏ victoric. whosoeuer therefore wil haue some examples, where a great shew is made of nothinge, to beware in him selfe of ẏ foly, let him marke these that folowe.

Har. fo. 101. *The cheif Authoritie beinge acknowleged and confeſſed, whether the he were called, by either of thoſe names that you deny, or no: it is not, of greate importance.*

Iew. 220 M. Hardinge ſeemeth in part willingly to yeeld. Againe:

It was as eaſy a matter for Chriſt, to geue Peter the Power and Title bothe togeather, as to geue him the power alone, without the Title.

Here, I can not chuſe but anſwer ſome what, though for deſire of ſhortneſſe I haue and muſt let many thinges paſſe, which might be ſtaied vpon. Who doubteth, but Chriſt in deede might haue geuen the Title (which M. Iew. findeth lackinge) togeather with the power and Authoritie ouer the Church: yet for ſo much as he hath not done it, it becometh not vs to find any imperfection in his doinges: but to honor them with all Reuerence, though we ſee no reaſon for them, or with all humilitie to thinke vpon them, whether good cauſes may be brought furth and alleged for them or no.

And truly, concerninge this matter of

w, ich

which we speake, we may rightly iudge, ỹ because weyght and worthinesse is in the Thinges them selues, therfore he gaue the power to S. Peter. As for Names and Titles, because they are so easely geuen (as appereth by styles of Noble men and Princes) his maiestie was not ouer curiouse in them. Yet, he left not S. Peter without a name of honor also, sayinge: *Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Petrus, a rocke or Stone.* Io. 1.

which Title, duly considered, is of more weight and worthinesse, than either the name of Head, Rector, Gouernor, Prince, or vniuersal Bishope. which as they signifie a Preeminence aboue others, so do they not warrant, a Continuance, a Stedfastnes, a sure Ground to buyld vpon, and a Principall and Chiefe Stone in the house of God, as Cephas or Petros (which are to say a Rocke) doe. for our Sauyour expressed it, in the hearinge of the twelue, and sayed to S. Peter only and specially: Christ gaue S. Peter a Title of dignitie and power.

Thou art Peter or a Rocke, and, ỹpō this rocke, will I buyld my Church, Mat. 16.

and the gates of hell shal not preuaile against it. And to thee will I geue, the keyes of the kingdome of heauens, and what thinge soeuer thou byndest vpon Earth, shalbe bound in heauē: & what thinge soeuer thou looseſt vpon Earth, shalbe loosed in Heauen.

Mary this Title of Vniuersall bishope or Head of the Church, he gaue not him in plaine Termes. But what of that? He instituted effectuall Sacramentes: yet he neuer called any of them by the name of Sacrament. He taught men to beleue in the Trinitie, yet the word is not found in all scripture. The prophet Dauid calleth the Apostles *Princes of all the Earth*, yet Christ which gaue them Authoritie ouer al, sayeth no more but: *Goe and Preach the Gospell to al creatures.* And againe, *I send you furth as sheepe emong wolues.* Againe: *your master is one, Christ, and al ye, are Brethern:* and neuer called them *Princes.*

Psal. 44.

Mar. 16.

Mat. 10.

Mat. 23.

How then? Doth M. Iew. find an im-

perfection in Christes doinges? And thinketh he secretly in his hart, that a Power is not well geuen without a Title? And that, if him selfe might haue ordered the matter, the Name and Office should haue ben geuen, both together: from whēce cometh this, that a wretched and a vile creature, hath to saye any thinge against his Maker? The Catholike Church is cōtēned, The iudgement of ỹ highest Bishope in the earth is condēned, & to hinder ỹ Pope, And āger ỹ Catholikes, he is not afraied to dally with Almightie God him selfe, And to aske of vs, whether it was not an easy matter for him, to geue Peter the Power and Title, altogether. That when we shall confesse the Title was not geuen, he may infer: Ergo neither the Power. Which argument, If your selfe M. Iewel thinke to be naught, what a wyse man are you, so trimly to set it furth? If it be good, what a Miserable felow are you, which dare so to speake of him, that is Alwyse, and Almightie? As though it should not be agreable, to geue a Power and not the Title. Confesse that you haue ouershot your selfe, in makinge so much, of a weake reason: Or looke to be Answeered accordingly.

To anger or trouble the Catholikes M. Iewel maketh obiections against God himselfe.

Either foolishe or blasphemous.

when him selfe shal come in Iudgement for such purpose. But let vs goe forward.

D. Har. Fo. 106. *To this Church of Rome, it is necessarie, al that be faithfull to repaire and come togeather: for the mightier Principalitie of the same.* Againe:

Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3. *Andrew receiued not the Primacie, but Peter.* Againe,

Amb. 2. Cor. 12. *The Primacie or Principalitie of the Apostolike Chayre, hath euermore bene in force in the Romaine Church.*

Now marke what M. Iew. concludeth. He answereth after his maner vnto euery one, but he triumpheth not therein, but in this, sayinge:

Aug. epi. 162.

Iew. 254 Here begynneth the daunting and bragging.

M. Hardinge trippinge (as he sayeth) so nicely ouer the Doctors, hath not yet once towched, the thinge that was looked for, and that he hath only, and with such affiance, take in hand For, notwithstanding a great Pope of wordes and the Names of manie holie Fathers, yet hath he not hitherto shewed, that the Bishope of Rome within the space of six hundred yeares after Christ, was euer called the Vniuersall bishope, Or the head of the vniuersall Church, VVhich thinge i

he

he could haue ſhewed, I beleue he wold not ſo lightlie haue tripte it ouer.

See, how ernest he is, vpon the name of Vniuerſall Bishop. And how sore him selfe stumbleth, at one simple word (Tripping.) And how much he craketh, before the end, that the word he looketh for, is not yet shewed. But see in an other place.

D. Harding, from the 108. leafe to the 119. of his boke, proueth the neceſſitie of one head, and authoritie of the Bishope of Rome. 1

By naturall reaſon. By Appeales made to Rome. By Excommunications directed from Rome. By Elections of Biſhopes, confirmed by the Pope. By his Approuinge or Diſprouinge of Councels, By reſtoringe, of Biſhopes wrongfulli cõdened, to their Churches. By Biſhops and Patriarches reconciled vnto him. 2. 3 4 5 6 7 And then goeinge forward in this matter, *Although it be a childiſh thinge (ſaieth he) to ſticke at the name, any thinge is called by, yet I will*

bringe

bringe good witneſſe for theſe names, VNIVERSAL BISHOPE & HEAD of the CHVRCH.

This, I trow, ſhould cauſe M. Iew. to be more calme and quiet, conſideringe that he ſhall not tary longe, but haue the very Names brought furth, which he craueth ſo much for. But, he muſt make ſomewhat of nothinge, and ſeeme to be a winner, before his aduerſarie ioyne with him. And therfore, he taketh him ſelfe to Coniectures and Gheaſſes, ſayinge:

Iew. fol. 295. In other copy of vn reaſonable crakinge.

Here M. Hardinge ſecretlie confeſſeth, that in al he hath hitherto alleaged, he hath not yet found, that the bishop of Rome was knowen in the world, within the ſpace of the firſt ſix hundred yeares after Chriſt, by the Name, either of the Vniuerſall bishop, or of the Head of the Church.

well, becauſe you are ſo importunate and haſtie with vs vpon the forſayd Titles: I can not ſtay now, to tell you here againe of your crakinge, but wil make ſpeede, to the places which might ſatisfie your expectation.

D. Hardinge therfore, from the 119. leafe,

leafe, to the 124. proueth, by S. Gregorie, *that the Councell of Chalcedon called the Bishop of Rome the vniuersall Bishop: And by S. Chrysostome, S. Hierome, S. Cyrill, and others, he proueth that Peter was called the Head of the Church.* Now betwene he sayeth, that euery where almost, *this Name is attributed to S. Peter either in Termes equiualent, or expresly.* Har. fo. 120.

Thereupon, M. Iewell triumpheth. Thus he doubteth at the matter and stammereth and faltereth at the beginninge. But if the B. of Rome were the Head of the Church in deede, so allowed and taken in the whole world: why was he neuer expresly and plainly Named so? VVas there no man in the world then, for the space of six hundred yeares, able to expresse his Name? Againe. It had bene the simpler and plainer dealinge for M. Hardinge to haue saied, This Name can not yet be found: and so to haue taken a longer daie. Iew. 302 More crabbinge.

What will you doe when you ouer-

come

come in deede, which although ſ stroke be but cominge, make reckeninge of your gaines, And accompt it halfe a Victorie, for that it is not more quickly geuen: But D. Hardinge, before he bringeth furth the expreſſe Terme (Head) to diminiſh the needeles curioſitie of ſome perſons, he ſayeth:

Har. fo. 822. *VVhat forceth it, whether that very terme (HEAD) be found in any auncient writer, or no?* And it foloweth, *But to take away occaſion of cauill, I wil alleage a few places, where the expreſſe Terme (HEAD) is attributed to Peter the firſt B. of Rome.*

Here now ſhould M. Iew. be attent, in harkeninge to the Obiection. But, as though al the matter were lyke to be loſt, for lacke of a good face to ſet vpon it, he looketh merily vpō the cauſe, And turneth his eye away from that which is coming againſt him, And is glad for a thinge paſt & gone, I can not tell what: Sayinge.

Iew. 306 Gentill reader, I beſeche the, marke wel this dealinge. This Name the (Head) of the vniuerſall Church is the (verie Thing) that we denie, And that M. Hardinge hath taken in hand

fol. 77.

hand to proue, And boldly auoucheth, that he hath already plainly ſhewed and proued the ſame: yet now, in the end, finding him ſelf deſtitute, he turneth it of, as a thinge of nought. Againe: VVithin the ſpace of the firſt ſix hundred yeares, there were in Rome 68. Bishops, for their Conſtance in fayth, for their vertu and Lerninge, far exceedinge the reſt that haue bene ſithence. The Number of them beinge ſo greate, their Learninge ſo notable, their Life ſo holie, it is meruaile M. Hardinge ſhould not be able to ſhowe that ani one of them al, in ſo Long time, was once caled the (Head) of the Church, & therfor ſhould thus reſt vpon S. Peter, who, when he receaued theſe Titles was not bishop of Rome, And of whom there is no queſtion moued.

Lyeinge and.

Iew. 20.

Braggin ge owt of meaſure.

Here lacketh (I confeſſe) no Inuention or Eyornation. A Title only or two are ſought for. The finding of which, is made to be of Greate Importance.

The omnipotencie of Chriſt is conſidered for the matter (becauſe he was hable to geaue the Power & Title both togeather) 1

The diſpoſition of the Aduerſarye (becauſe if he could, he would bring them furthe.) 2

The ſpace of ſix hundred yeres (whether 3

in

in that tyme no man was hable to expresse them.)

4 The number and worthinesse of 68. Bish hopes of Rome, (with a special maruel, ỹ M. Hardinge should not be hable to shew that any one of them al, in so Longe tyme was once called Heade of the Church.) And al this (with much more, which I let passe) is considered and Amplified to the most Vantage, As though it would be saide: Good Lord what a felow is he, that hath so opposed al the world? And how can that be, but of Greate force to saluation, about which, so Notable a Clerke doth keepe so greuous a Stur?

Yet in very deede, those his Sentences are not Argumentes of his well sayinge, but rather Copies, of his foule crakinge. Which how vayne and vnsensible it is, let it now be tried, by indifferēt Readers. For, if it had ben plainly Answered vnto him, at the beginninge: That these forsaied Titles could not be found, he might (I graunt)

Iew. 306 haue Concluded as he doth: Ergo mie assertion is true, (vnderstād verbo tenus, that is, concerninge the outward sound of ỹ word only) But Crake thereof he could not by any right: Because he winneth no more, but that no such Name was then vsed: and

cometh

cometh not to the Thinge it selfe, and Substaunce of the questiō. Yea rather, he might be ashamed, To Looke so bygge, And Speake so lowdly, And Prouoke so generally, And Stur about so busily, And geaue great hope of victorie, And when all that he asketh, is Graunted, to be able to make no other vantage, but only this: Ergo mie assertion is True. Yea forsoth A worthie Assertion, To proue that, And stand vpon ẏ, And bragge on that, which the Aduersarie may easely graunt, without any losse of the cause, & you hauinge it yelded vnto you, cā infer nothing against ẏ Popes supremicie.

Take it vnto you M. Iew. that the name, Vniuersall Head, is not found: we are content with ẏ sense or Meaninge of the name. Returne you home, from your Greate fight, with certaine bare Titles & Letters: And the aduersarie hath not much to complaine, keepinge the Thinge it selfe with him, vnder other wordes and Letters.

A Greate victorie and nothing taken.

You haue done valiantly, (I trow) to stand against al mē aline vpon two names and Titles: And we are not much hurted, when, for all your Cost, and Charges, you haue come nothing nigh to ẏ matter, which by those Names or other, is imported.

Thus

Thus, if D. Hardinge would make shoꝛt, and graunt vnto M. Iew. his Assertion: Yet should he so litle make any Bost oꝛ Triumphe thereof, that he might rather be ashamed, to leaue the Thinges them selues, and strine vpon the bare Names of them. But, on the other side, now, whereas D. Harding hath, not only so declared the cause of the B. of Rome, that, without seekinge oꝛ caringe foꝛ the Names of *Vniuersall Bishop or head*, he hath, plainely proued his Supremicie: But also hath condescended vnto M. Iewels Infirmitie oꝛ Curiositie, And hath brought furth, in conuenient place, the very Names themselues which M. Iew. demaundeth: what modestie oꝛ honestie is this, so, to Triumph, and Crake, as though thei were not at al found out and recited?

Consider M. Iewels behauiour.

If he Answered D. Hardinge before he had Read what he had sayed: he Answered by happ and not by cunninge: If he Read ouer this Article, before he beganne to Replie against it, how did he not marke, that in the later part thereof, the very Names which he asketh foꝛ, are alleged out of the Auncient Fathers? And then further, how should he, so, either dissemble oꝛ trifle, as, to

presse

prelle in still vpon his aduersarie, with Im portunate & Impertinēt askinge for those Titles, (the place of shewinge the which foloweth afterward) and thereupon so solemly to Triumph, as though no such Title were to be found at all, because they were not found Immediatly in the beginninge of the Article, but in the latermost part only thereof?

But here now let vs consider, whether M. Iew. as he was hastie in askinge for those foresaied Titles, whiles the place was not yet come where D. Hardinge apointed to vtter thē: so now, whē they are brought furth against him let vs see whether he shifteth not as fast away from them, as euer he was Inquisitiue for them, And whether he do not in deede Trip nicely ouer the Doctors:

Leo the greate, B. of Rome, was called in the Councell of Chalcedon by the Name of VNIVRSAL BISHOP. And this Councell was within the sir hundred yeares after Christ: *Ergo your Assertion M. Iew. is false.* Har. fol. 119.

Note the seuen fetches or flinges, or vagaries, or delaies or trials how to escape,

In answeringe to this Argument, first you comfort your selfe, that this is the first Testimonie of D Hardinges, for profe

which M. Iewel here maketh before he come to answer directly. Iew. 295

of the Name it selfe: with, Ergo hitherto, he hath not found it. Much good may it do you if you can make anie thing of it, sauing a Beggarly and an Idle Bragge.

2. Then, you signifie, that you will sticke at the Name it selfe. Because D. Hardinge warned you, *That ỹ Thinge sufficiently proued, to sticke at ỹ Name it self was but a childish point.* Hard. fol. 119.

3. After this, you cast the Accompt, that the Councell of Chalcedon was holden in the yeare of our lord 488. Ergo of the whole number of the six hundred yeares, M. Hardinge freely euen at the sight, hath yelded vs backe, foure hundred eight skore and eight yeares (writen out at length and not in figures of Arithmetike, to make the more show) towardes the rekeninge. Iew. 296. As who should say, he shall not goe backe againe, And glad I am that there remayne but 112. yeares to accompt vpon, for the which I will Shift well enough.

Fourthly, He addeth that Leo Accuseth that whole Councell of Ambition, and that the Apostolike See of Rome, in part allowed it not. By which you may gather, that the Pope thē, much within ỹ 600. after Christ, toke

toke him selfe to be of Greater Authoritie then the whole Councel: the Actes wherof, he either Confirmed or Disalowed by his final sentence.

After this you come to VVhat If, and say: VVhat if there were no such Title, either Geauen or offered in the Councell? Againe: VVhy doth not M. Hardinge alleage, either ỳ Place or the Canō or the wordes? Againe. Why geaueth he no Note in the Margine? &c. Mary, because he went not about to proue his sayinge by any Canon or decree of ỳ Councell, but by other sufficient authoritie. 5

Now a man would thinke that by this tyme, ye had tryfled enough. Yet ye procede in your Vanitie, & find matter of talke where none is geuē, with: Perhaps he will say, this Canon was burnt by some heretikes. &c. No M. Iew. he wil not say so: Yet you, as though he were like to say it, do make a Solemne & Curiouse Confutation of it: How that it were much for him to say so. And concludinge with a victorious Epiphonema and Acclamation, ye Vaunt and say. M. Hardinge hath no other Councell, within 600. yeares after Christ to hold by, but only this: and yet the same can not be found. 6 Iew. 197. Iew. 197

Wel syr, what haue ye more to daly vpō?

M ij will

will ye now at length come to the matter? You haue perchaunce forgot your selfe, And therfore I will put you in memorie, what you must answer vnto.

D. Harding, to proue that the B. of Rome hath ben called by the Name of Vniuersall bishop, allegeth S. Gregorie. You haue asked where it is to be found in the Councel, And you would make him to be laughed at, Or discredited, that He allegeth a Coūcell without a Canō. But he speaketh it expressely ẏ, you shall looke for it, not in ẏ Coūcell, but in S. GREGORIE. what answer ye now?

Iew. 198

Iew.

This is an vntruth to beguile the reader.

Then I beshrew the lyer. But, how do you proue it?

197. Shift.

For Gregorie sayeth not, the bishops in that Councell, Saluted, Intitled, Proclamed, or Called the bishop of Rome by that name: only he saieth, the Name of Vniuersal bishop was Offered by the Councell of Chalcedon to the B. of Rome. He saieth they Offered to Call him so, but that they Called him so in deede, he saieth not.

S. Gregorie shamefully interpreted.

what meane you here by, They OFFERED to call him so? Is OFFERED taken there, for makinge a Profer, Or for goinge about to call him so? If it be, how might

might this Ridle of yours be perceaued? or how might I conceaue, that they made such an Offer? First, they stode vp perchaunce, They looked one vpon another, They turned them selues to ỹ Presidentes of that Councell, They held furth their hãdes as if they had somewhat to geaue, They bowed w̃ their bodies, They gaped & breathed, like mẽ very desyrouse & willinge to Offer some what: but speake they durst not. Who then can tell vs, of their Meaninge? or who can say, that those Bishops, by these Gestures, do Intend to call the B. of Rome, an Vniuersall bishop? For, A thousand other matters there are, which may lye in the hart of man, before the vtteringe of which, these Profers and Signes do goe.

How can M. Iew. then, make vs vnderstand it, that the Offers which the Fathers of the Chalcedõ Councell made, were Proper and Speciall tokens of the Title Vniuersal bishop, which they were readie to call him by, And not of some other thinge? Or how can he say, that not Callinge him so in deede, they went yet about it to Call him so? Thinketh he, that they had respect so longe before, to his Honestie, And feared to let the Title of Vniuersall bishop to passe

their Lippes, least M. Iew. should be constrained to yeld and Subscribe, and that therfore they Offered (no man I beleue can tell how) to Call him so, but Called him not so in deede.

Suppose it M. Iewel (which is probable enough, least by denienge my case, you should crie, Alas, then hath he lost a good argument) suppose I say, that A Catholike were before you, And consideringe your outward Behauior, with Relation had to your Bookes, Or otherwise takinge Occasion or Indignation, would thinke you in his conscience, to be an Hypocrite and A wrangler, And therewith Offer to call you so: except he vtter so much by expresse word or writinge of his owne, Or consent vnto it, by some other mans mouth or hande, could you, with all your Lerned Councell, be able to charge him therewithall, and say that In deede he Called you not so, but yet Offered so to doe? No surely, except ye had A Familiar (which through his subtilitie of Nature, is able to ghesse better of a mans intent and meaninge, than the quickest person of sight and witt in all the word) no mortall Creature is able to know what is within a man.

Returns

Returne then, with your consideration, vnto the fathers of the Chalcedon Counsell. If they Offered to call ỳ B. of Rome vniuersall Bishop, either that was perceaued by their wordes, either by their writinge, or some other plaine Signe. If by writinge, that confirmeth the Popes Supremicie better, then if they had but spokē it, because it tarieth longer, and testifieth plainer. If by wordes, then vndoubtedly they called him so. But, if they made but a Profer, and did it not in deede, who could tell you, that their Profer had such a Sense and Meaninge in it? whereas it is impossible to know particularly, what an other thinketh, except it be vttered of the partie him selfe, by some word, or Signe as good as his word? And bysides this, If you can say, that their Secret mind and wil was so bent and disposed toward the B. of Rome as you imagine, how so euer you came by ỳ knowledge, yet this is manifest, ỳ it must not be absurd for vs to geaue him a Singular Reuerence and Obedience, whō so Great & Graue a Councel thought in their hartes, to excell in authoritie aboue others, & therfore should Offer (to signifie their good will) to cal him Vniuersal bishop

though in deede they called him not so.

But who is the Author of this false tale? M. Iewel. where had he it? Of S. Gregorie, as he sayeth. But doth S. Gregorie say so? be not these his very wordes: Nomen OBLATVM est, the name was OFFERED? Doth it not serue the purpose of which he speaketh in those Epistles, that the Name was in deede geauen to his Predecessors? For he sayeth, that they neuer consented to receiue it. But how could this be, except that very Name, which they refused, had ben Offered? for if they did but Offer to cal him so: then did they not yet so cal him. & not callinge him by the name, how could the other well refuse, that, which at all was not vttered? But that this shift of Interpretation may not serue you, marke what S. Gregorie writeth vnto the Bishop of Constantinople.

The forsayed shift vtterly taken awaie.

Lib. 4. epist. 38.

VVere not the Bishops (as your holinesse knoweth) of this Apostolike see, (which by Gods disposinge I serue and attend) called (by the reuerend Coūcel of Chalcedō VNIVERSALES VNIVERSAL› *by an Honor or Name (not sought for, but) Offered?*

The B. of Rome called vniuersal.

Oblato honore.

Here M. Iewel ye haue, that the B. of Rome were called so. S. Gregory testifieth it, his Authority you seeme to regard & honor, especially in this matter of Vniuersall Bishop. Ergo your Assertion is false, following the very word and Title, which so Cowhartly, and yet Braggingly allwaies you driue vs to finde. And now therefore you must Subscribe. Except you will flee from the word, vpon which you haue hitherto so much sticked, vnto your Meaning vpon the word. which we woulde fayne haue you to do: but thē, you could not crake as you haue done, by setting forth your self, vnder this bare Title of vniuersall Bishop or Head. &c. which now being found out against you, you begin to seke more rome because you are pinched, and to extende this word CALLED to signify, SALVTED, INTITLED, PROCLAIMED, but this Shift is not yet so currant. Howbeit, great feare there is, leaste after an other boke set forthe as big as this whiche already is made, by much turning of wordes, ye will more often vse INTITLED and PROCLAIMED in steade of Called, that the question may be, not what was thē done, but what OPENLY and Ordinarily

was

was INTITLED and PROCLAIMED.

But let vs cõsider a plainer place against you, and so discouer an other maner of shifting. You sticke vpon the bare name, and as long as the Equiualent, and not ỹ same which you specified, is brought forth, ye insult still and egge your Aduersarye. what wil you say now then, whẽ it shalbe plainly shewed? Athanasius, Ischyriõ, Theodorus saluted S. Leo in three sundry Epistles, by the name of Vniuersall Patriarche: Ergo your Assertion is false and you must Subscribe. How auoid you? Mary ye cõfesse it to be true.

Iew. 298 But of that whole number of sixe hundred and thirty Bishops, there assẽbled, I trow M. Harding is not wel able to shew, that any one euer Saluted or Called him so.

what a spyte and wrecfulnes Why doe you take your question so, that three honest mens Testimonies are not sufficient, but you must haue a whole Coũcell to call the Pope Vniuersall Bishop, Or els ye wil not be confuted? You asked, whether

Iew. 220 the B. of Rome was then called vniuersall Bishop. And you limited it not within the cõpasse of Generall Councell. Therfore if ye

wil

will sticke to the wordes, you muste Subscribe, Or els confesse, that this was one of the shiftes which you kept in store.

But why should you refuse the Testimonies of Athanasius, Ischyrion, and Theodorus, supposing that it were true, ẏ in the Councel of Chalcedon, no one called the B. of Rome Vniuersall Bishop? The one of them, Athanasius, was a Priest, the other two were Deacons. But what of that? you make light of them as though they were some abiectes of the world, and say:

A straunge Priest, and two poore Deacons in their Priuate Sutes for their Goodes and Legacies, named Leo the Vniuersall Bishop. Iew. 298

Ergo, within six hundred yeares after Christe, there were that Called and Saluted the B. of Rome Vniuersall Bishop. But now ye except against Priestes, and poore Deacons, and suche as haue sutes, and perchãce ye will allowe none of the Clergy for a witnesse, except he be a Bishop, and sit in a generall Councell, Or a Noble and Riche Prelate. Ergo, here againe ye sticke not to the wordes of your question, but shewe vs a Copy of another kind of your shifting.

Howe

How say ye now then to S. Peter? He was Bishop of Rome, and he was called Heade of the Churche: Ergo, a Bishop of Rome was called Head of the Churche. Haue ye any shift for this argument?

Iew. 308 But M. Harding knoweth the cale is moued not of S. Peter, but specially and namely of the bishop of Rome.

But Master D. Harding inferreth, that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome: ergo your Assertion is false, if you sticke to the bare Letter of your question, and inuent not some otherway to eskape by. But when wil M. Iewel be to seeking? For I dout not (sayeth he)

Iew. 309 But M. Harding doth remember, that the question that lieth betweene vs, riseth not of any Extraordinary Name once or twice geuen vpon some speciall Affection: but of the vsuall and knowen Title of the Bishoppe of Rome.

Shifting and lying.

How shoulde he remember that, whiche you were not so Gentle or wise, to tel him of? Haue ye not alwaies pressed hym, with bringing forth of the Name of vniuersal Bishop? Haue ye not misliked with him for it, that he would not be bound to shewe the Name, though he brought as much in sense

as

as the Name importeth?

This haue ye done through your whole Aunswer with extreme Craking and Insultation. And now, when to satisfy your fantasticall request, he hath alleaged the very Names and Titles, which you vaunted your selfe so much vpon, as thoughe they were neuer able to be found in any wryter: ye flee to the Interpretation and Limitation of your question, and stick not to ỹ plain and Grammatical construction of it.

And now (see the vanity) your selfe are able to bring forth good Authoritye, where some Bishop of the worlde was called vniuersall Patriarch, and that, not by shifting of Termes one for another, but in plaine, manifest and expresse wordes, and suche as in no wise, may be denied. Iew. 300. Hipocrite.

Say you so? why then haue you, all this while, made such a matter of findinge oute these Termes vniuersal bishop, and hed. &c. as though you would straight waies subscribe and yeld, if you might therein be answered. And why say you so constantly in an other place, This Name is the verye thing that we deny. If your selfe haue the places for that purpose already prepared & gathered (vndoubtedly to the Greate praise of Iew. 306.

your

your Note Boke) why doe you with suche brauery demaund them of your Aduersaries? Or with extreme Iniquitie, make a Tumult and Stur in mens consciencies for that word, in which your selfe do know you are but a Bragger? For, if the Bishope of Constantinople were called an Vniuersall Patriarch & cæt. how could you mistruste, but as much and with more reason, might haue bene sayed of the B. of Rome, which was (as you confesse) the Cheife of the four Patriaches? Or how could you be so earnest, in reprouinge of that Title, which your wisedome confesseth (for a Surplusage to shew your greate lerning and study) to haue bene geuen to baser persons then the B. of Rome is?

If your Conscience were open, through your owne sincere and true Dealing, Or if by the Authorities, which we should allege, you were constrayned, outwardly to expresse, what ye conceane and cõcele within: then should it be euident in sight, that ye passe no more for the Names of Vniuersall Bishope, Or Head of the Vniuersal Church, though a thowsand Fathers had geauen them to the B. of of Rome: then you doe regard the Termes, Realy, Verely & truly

with

with such like, when they are by Catholike writers attributed to Christes body in the Sacrament. And like as whē these words, *Principality, Primacy, Cheife Rule or Ruler*, are proued to haue ben spokē by old Fathers of ỹ See of Rome, or B. there: you turne your selfe to some dictionary or Etimologicō of your owne or others, & say, A Principal Church, is sometime vsed of the Fathers in this sense, to signifie a Ciuil dominiō or principalitie of a Citie. Againe, Primatus is vsed for any superioriti or prefermēt aboue others: Againe, Princeps, in the latin tōge is oftē vsed for a má, that, for his vertu or rome, or any singular qualitie, is to be had in estimatiō aboue others: To be short, wheras you say, being pressed to S. Ambrose authoritie which called Damasus ỹ B. of Rome, *The Rector & gouernor of ỹ church*: Let vs cōsider whether the selfsame form of speach, haue bē applied to any other in like sort. By which shift, you satisfie ỹ cōmō readers, vntil you be againe answered to your greater cōfusiō: so, hauing in your bosō, I am sure, like distinctiōs & expositiōs, wher Vniuersal B. & Head of the church, are sundry wayes vsed, you wold neuer (if you had ben a quiet mā & louer of truth) so lōg haue cōtinued,

in re-

Iew. 244

Iew. 245

Iew. 246

Iew. 306

Iew. seketh not peace and concord, but contēction and strife.

in requiring those very Termes to be alleged, which, as you do expound them, proue not to you sufficiētly ẏ Popes Supremicy.

294 You affirme, that, in deede in a kinde of speach, both Rome and Antioche, and other great Cities, famous for Religion, may be called the Head and Spring of the Gospel. And what shal let you then to turne thē to phrases, whatsoeuer Titles be found attributed to the B. of Rome: & so, by a kind of speach, to make that Common which is Singular: wherby it is manifest that ye maintain Cōtention, and put those thinges forth, which you know to be Needlesse and Weake, and Feeble, only to try perchaunce the strength of your Aduersaries, to the Commēdation of your owne Learning, Or Uttering of ẏ Notes which ye haue gathered, Or to oppresse your Answerer wyth multitude of words and quarels, ẏ for the very heaps of them, being either not Answered at all, Or answered not so speedily, you might triūph in ẏ meane space, wtout probability. For, when ẏ Catholikes alleage Termes of like force and Equiualent, then wil you haue no other but the Names of Vniuersall Bishop and Head &c and then the Name is the thing that you deny.

From one corner to an other.

Any

And when those selues same very NAMES are brought before you, then ye make as though it were no harde matter to haue founde them out, but then bring you the lyke of your owne Motion: and then you run to Limitations vpon your question, and to Shifting frome one point to another, declaringe thereby, that your sense only is to be cõsidered, although ye peeked the quarell against the word. But where will you staie your selfe?

For if it were proued, in most ample manner, with al Conditions and Circumstances (as you by Shifting, haue nowe added to the Principall question) that, the B. of Rome was not called, but Intitled and Proclamed, not of Priests & poore Deacons, but of some Riche Prelates sitting in GENERAL COVNCEL, and that, not once or twise vpõ fauor, but by an Vsuall and knowen Stile: All this would not conuert M. Iewel. For in the end of this Article these be his wordes, Or rather his difinitiue sentence:

Although that which the Pope claymeth, were his very right, yet by his owne Iudgement, he is whorthie to lose it. For Pope Gregorie saieth: Priuilegium meretur amittere, qui abutitur potestate. He that abuseth Extreme shift. Iew. 314.

his authoritie, is worthie to loſe his priuilege. And Pope Siluerius ſayeth: Etiam quod habuit amittat, qui quod non accepit, vſurpat. He that vſurpeth that he receaued not, let him looſe that he had.

Be it ſo. He, for his own part deſerueth. Like as the Temporal heades and Princes of the world, whē they doe not their office, are worthie of loſinge it. But who ſhall depoſe them? It muſt be done by Law, and not by Inſurrection. And vntil lawful proceſſe againſt them be ended, the Common wealthes are bound to obey them, be they neuer ſo vnworthie. Yet the Princes are made by men, and receaue Authoritie, not immediatly from God, but of the Cōmon wealth which doth chooſe them. But the Pope, whome Chriſt him ſelfe (without Conſent of men goinge before, or voyce of ỹ world) hath made Head of his Church, throughout the whole worlde: who ſhall take his Priuilege frome him, if he ſhould be thereof vnworthie?

For the Prerogatiue and chiefe Authoritie geauen by God, muſte continew, what ſoeuer the partye his merites are,

The

The Apostle also saieng:

There is no power except it be frō God: and obey your Prepositours and such as are set ouer you. Rom. 13. Heb. 13.

And if the chosen of God, King Dauid hauinge Saull at a vantage, besought God to staye his handes, that hym selfe might not kill hym, sweringe, that, As trewlye as GOD liueth, excepte God stroke hym, or hys tyme were come to dye, or he should be destroyed in Battayle, he would not lay hāds vpon the Anoynted of God: And if our Saviour Christe commaunded the Iewes, 1. Reg. 24

To doe that which the Scribes and Pharisies dyd saye vnto them, though their lyuing and behauiour otherwise was so euill, that he charged them, not to doe as they dyd,

who dare be so bould, as hurte or disobeye, the Anoynted of God, The Highest Bisshoppe in all Christendome, the Successour of S. Peter, lawfullye sittyng in Chaire and Place, of Instructinge and gouerning the Faithfull?

wil the Superintendētes of the Church of England doe it? By what law and reason? Mary, ỹ Canon law shalbe brought furth, 11. quæst. 2. priuilegium. and 25. quæst. 2. Sic decet & cæt. And M. Iewel shal alleage a Glose or make a Glose vpon it, Of which the whole Fraternity must cōclude, that if it were neuer so much proued, that the B. of Rome, was called in the six hundred yeres after Christ, Head of the Vniuersall Church, And though it were his verye Right: Yet, for as much he abuseth his Priuilege, he deserueth to leese it, And we wil haue him no more Obeied. Fare well he. And so breketh out this fourth Artitle, into Presumptuons Contempte of Lawfull Authoritie.

1 Thus haue we the cumpasse of M. Iewels trifling Processe. First, the Name (he saieth) can not be found, and as long as that Answer will hold, he Insulteth and Braggeth like Iewel him selfe.

2 Then, the Calling of S. Leo Vniuersal Bisshope, in the Councel of Chalcedon, was not a Calling of him so in deede, but an Offering to cal him so. And so the testymony of ỹ inward Goodwill is not sufficiente, but he muste haue it declared by

worde

worde of mouthe.

Thirdly, poore Prieſtes and Deacons, 3
but none of the Councell of Chalcedon did geue it. So by like none but Noble Perſonages, and men of honor ſhall geaue Voices.

Fourthly, though S. Peter, the firſt 4
Biſhope of Rome, were ſo called, yet the queſtion is not moued of him, but of the Pope. So might the Succeſſour challenge nothing, of the Prerogatiue of his Predeceſſour.

Fyfthly, if it were geuen but once Or 5
twiſe, it is no matter: becauſe our queſtion (ſayth he) is of the Vſual Stile. So muſt we bringe furth a Proclamation (I trow) Or Scale for it, Or els nothing is done.

Sixthly in a kinde of Speache the B. 6
of Rome, as alſo of Conſtantinople may be called by the Title of VNIVERSAL. So ſhall it be but a Phraſe only, and of no weight Or Subſtance, what ſo euer be alleaged for theſe Titles aforſayed.

Laſt of all, if it were the Popes Right, 7
Yet is he worthy to leeſe it. And ſo it booteth no more, to Reaſon of this queſtion, for that they haue done, they wil not alter: Such is their finall determination.

By which way of violence and force, if the cause of Religion may be followed, ye will be to stronge (M. Iewel) not only for Oppressed Catholikes in these your prosperous daies, but allso againste quiet Catholikes, where they liue with the loue of their Soueraignes. But if this muste needes seeme vnreasonable in Professors of a new Gospel, which take vpon them to direct vs by the expresse woorde of the Lorde in the right knowledge of all Truthe and Honesty: I will truste, that this Detection of you their Chiefe man of warre, Shifting, Striuing, Craking, Dissembling, Lying, Triumphing. &c. will cause the Indifferent Reader, to

Beware of M. Iewel.

(❧.⁘.❧)

❧

Thus endeth the First Booke.

THE SECOND

Booke, Declaring by more Speciall Detection of M. Iewels behauiour, that it is needeful to BEWARE of hym.

THE proper Conueiaunce and Art, which M. Iewel hath vsed in the foresayed Articles, I haue for the speciall poyntes of those questiõs, shortly and sufficiently discouered.

For which his conueyance, although the Indifferent or waueringe myndes, should wisely BEWARE of him, and his owne frendes and deere brothers the Protestantes, myght with a good zeale require

of him, either to begyn a Newe Challenge, Or defende him selfe better in the Old: And thoughe I my selfe might, for these causes, thinke enough to be already sayed againste him: Yet because Affection and Loue is not only blinde in it selfe, but darkeneth also the sighte of vnderstandinge and Reason, that his Fauorers will not lightly perceaue his foule fasshions, except they appeere both Many, and Great, and Notable: And because the weaker and doubtfuller in such mater, are not satisfyed with sufficiente, but require abundance and euidencie: I will for these two sortes of mens sakes, declare yet further and plainer, what worthinesse is in M. Iewels Replye.

Of the Common Places which M. Iewel hath ouercharged his boke withal, in the first four Articles.

CAP. 1.

FIrst, concerning the outward shewe only and face of his boke, it is so great in quantitye, so faire in sight, and so Liuely (as I may say) by reſō of many Allegations and Authorities, out of Councels, Fathers, Histories, Laws Ciuil and Canon, and the Glose also therevpon: that it cummeeh very quickly into ones minde, to thinke: that, a matter of nothing, should not increase to such bygnes, nor an euil fauored cause so well be set furth, nor Auncient witnesses be so thickly brought out to no purpose.

And this I take to be one knacke of his cunning, that he prouided to make his Replie in such a forme, as might dehort some frome the Reading (because of the length thereof not agreeinge with theyr greate businesse) And amase other in reading (because it cumbreth the memory with so many matters) And gette some renoune and

praise

praise to his owne side, thoughe there followed no Reading (because it wil be commonly beleued, that, I trow) in makinge so many wordes, he is not to seeking of an Answer.

And if he will not haue me to call it, a knacke of his Cunning, then surely will it be proued to be, a Lacke of discretion: so that he shall not escape iust reproche, either for his craftines, if he perceyued it, either for his dulnesse, if he did not consider it. For the biggnesse of a boke is not reprouable, if accordinge to the nature of the matter, the handeling of it be proportioned. But, whosoeuer increaseth his worke aboue mesure, by taking in that which is not agreable: either he is to wise for the Simple, by making them conceiue muche of that whiche is litle: Or he is not wise enough in the iudgement of the Learned, by puffinge that vp to a greate quantitie, which would, by reason, be lesse in Sight and more in Substance.

But lete vs, firste, make our Obiection and also proue it, and then, afterwardes, consyder whether it dothe argue, a Craftines rather, or a dullnes to be founde

in

in M. Iewels Inuention.

I laye it then vnto your faulte, that ye haue ouercharged your Booke, with Common Places and Impertinent.

And, because I woulde be, mye selfe, the better perceyued, and you also thereby, shoulde be directed, the moze Orderly to make your Answer: I take your Common Places to be of two kindes.

The one consystethe of Thinges, which we maye vse as well as you: And to the vsynge of whiche, you doe peeke an Occasion out of the Question it selfe, though you neede not yet to vse it at all, or els moze Discretelye, shoulde haue vsed it.

And these I call Common Places.

The other consisteth of suche Matters, as we can not, or maye not vse, and whiche you also should, at no tyme, followe, thoughe it be moste familiar with you. And if at any other tyme you might, yet in the case of these Articles whiche are proponed, you had no occasion to vse them.

And these I cal digressions, not because the

the foresayed places might not runne vnder that Title: but because in them, you may pretend some excuse, and here you can bringe none.

To begyn therfore with your Common places, you are surely no niggard of them. Out it gothe, vpon neuer so litle occasion, that which you haue gathered, and if none at all be expressely offered, yet you will make one, rather then not vtter your cunning. Will you haue a fewe notes of them? I could serue you, with a hundred and odde, gathered out of one halfe only of your boke and no more. But these few, which I shall recken may be sufficient, bothe to proue my obiection true, and cause you to amend that fault hereafter.

Iewel. Pag. 15 Euery man ought to prepare himselfe, before he come to God.

25. The example of Christ must be folowed.

28 The company of Communicantes was called Communio.

The wicked Communicate togeather.

28. Small faultes are not to be contemned.

45. Heretikes haue alleaged Custome.

52. Deceauers blase their doings by the names

66. of

of famous men.
The company of Prieſtes was greate in the old time. 89
The people in old time did Communicate. 94
We muſt be obedient to God. 101
We muſt not hang vpon the authoritie of mortall men. 107
Chriſtes inſtitution muſt be kept. 111
Gods holye ſpirite bloweth, where it thinketh good. 118
The fewer places muſte be expounded by the moe. 127
The myſteries were kept in both kindes. 131
Manye abuſes haue bene about the myſteries. 141
Hauing Gods woorde we want no authoritye. 143
All the Eaſt ſpake not one tounge. 162
Religion came not firſt from Rome. 167
God loketh not for vtterance of voyce. 171
The people of Hyppo ſpake Latin. 181
Appeale is to be made to the Churche in doubtfull caſes. 204
Great profite in reading of Scriptures. 210
Ignorance is the mother of errours. 216
One Bishop muſt be in one City. 229
Vniuerſa Fraternitas, the whole brotherhoode, ſignifieth the companie within euerie ſeuerall and particular Dioceſe. 230

Prin-

241 { Princes haue ben fauorable to Biſhops.
Papa in old tyme ſignified Father, and was geuen generallie to all Biſhopes.

242 The prerogatiue to ſit before other, is called προεδρία.

259 In the old tymes, men that ſtode in doubt, ſought vnto the beſt learned.

263 The Biſhopes of other Countries called the Biſhope of Rome brother, or felow.

280 It is lawful for Biſhopes, to excõmunicat.

281 Biſhopes haue the alowing, of the Electiõ or conſecration of Biſhops.

295 Euery great Metropolitane Citie within her owne Prouince, may be honored with the Title of Mother Church.

300 The Title (Vniuerſall) hath bene geuen to ſome Biſhoppes.

These be your Common places, M. Iewell: but these, by the third part, are not all that I doe finde in halfe your boke. And if they were all, yet they might haue occupied, by very many partes, lesse roome in your Booke, then they doe. What cause then, why you dilated them so much?

Let vs come to one or two particulars. That Christes Institution is to be kepte, is one of your Common places. An other is.

That

That the people of old tyme did Communicate with the Prieſt.

The firſt of theſe you ſpeake muche for, and allege to that purpoſe:

S. Paul. 1. Cor. 11. Iew. 25
S. Hierom in. 1. Cor. 11. 60
S. Matthe. 26. 91
S. Chryſoſtom. Ho. 61 Ad Po. Antioch. 111 143 144
S. Cyprian. li. 2. Ep. 3. and, ad Iubaianum. 150

And again, S. Cyprian. li. 2. Ep. 3.
S. Hierom ad Galat. li. 3. ca. 5.
S. Hylar. ad Conſt. Auguſtum.
S. Auguſtin. de vnitate Eccleſiæ.
And, S. Cyprian once againe: lib. 2. Epi. 3.

Beſides Indignations and Inuectiues of your owne againſte the Catholikes in this matter, as thoughe they coulde not abide Chriſtes Inſtitution,

In

In folowing of which Place, if you had spared your selfe and bestowed that Tyme and Labor in defynyng of Christs Institution vnto vs, which you wasted to no purpose in proving that it must be obserued, it had ben wel spent of you and as we Looked for: but to proue that which is not doubted of, and to leaue the doubt vnresolued, which ōly is moued, it serueth to make the Replie Greate, but not to make it persite and full.

Iew. 11. 30. 37. 38. 42. 78. 94. The second you proue by S. James Lyturgie, Abdias in vita S. Thomæ, & S. Matthei, Iustinus Mart. Apol. 2. Dionys. Eccl. Hist. cap. 3. S. Basil. Lyturgie, S. Chrisostomes Lyturgie. S. Ignatius ad Philad. S. Paul. 2. Cor. 10. S. Hierome 1. Cor. 11, S. Chrysost. 1. Cor. Hom. 27. S. August. In Ioan. tract. 26. S. Chrysostom 1. Cor. Hom. 24. S. Cyprian ad Magnum. S. Cyril in Ioan. lib. 11. cap. 26. S. Hierom in Eccl. cap. 3. Iusti. Martyr Apol. 2. Concil Agathēse cap. 60. epist. Decret. Syricij. S. Hierom in 1. Cor. 11. S. Ambro. 1. Cor. 11. Canon Apost. cap. 9. And by the Canon law it selfe, the authoritie whereof you doe despise: De Consecr. distin. 2. Peracta. distin. 2. Episcopus distin. 2. Si non. distin. 2. Si quis.

Bysides these you alleage. S. Clement

Ep.

Ep. 2. S. Auguſtin. lib. 2. de ſermon. Dom. in monte. S. Auguſt. in pſal. 16. Clemens. Stro. lib. 1. S. Chryſoſ. 1. Cor. Hom. 27. S. Chryſoſt. 2. Cor. Hom. 18. S. Gregori Dialog. lib. 2. cap. 23. And when you haue al done, no mã doubteth of it.

what meaneth it then, that you in ſo Many Places, ſo Abundantly, and ſo Exactly, haue commended and ſet furth theſe two Concluſions: Thought you the Catholikes to be ſo wicked, that, they would contemne, the expreſſe Inſtitution of Chriſt: Or to be ſo ignorant of ſo cõmon a matter, as in the primitiue Church, was, and yet now ſtill is, the Communion: Thẽ are you ſurely, either euill diſpoſed, or ſimply practiſed. But thought you it good, to vtter (howſoeuer it were) what you had to ſay for theſe matters? Verily then, either you hoped thereby to make ſome thinke well of your Cunning (and that was a crafty Inuention) Or els without further reſpect to any your Vantage, yow buſied only your ſelf in a Needleſſe Matter: And that was a plaine Vanitie.

1

2

Of al naught choſe the leaſt, and it would be amended. 1

Now, if it was not, neither for lack of Conſcience in you, nor for lack of Intelligence, that you haue taken ſo greate a paine

2

to proue moste vndoubted and cleare Conclusions: it remayneth that you Answer my Obiection by some likely cause and reason, And shew, wherefore you haue bene so Longe and Tediouse in copiouse and oft repeted prouinge of a plaine Conclusion. Untill which tyme it is easie to be perceyued: that these Common Places of yours keepe a Vaine and Superfluous sturr in your Replie to M. Harding.

* Note.

COncerning this later Common place so lernedly proued by M. Iewel, beware of this One Argument.

There was alwaies a Communion in the Primitiue Church: Ergo there was no Masse.

For as the world goeth now, this word A Communion, doth signifie, either the act of some receiuing togeather, either that proper kinde of Seruice, which is now vsed in England at the Ministration of the Lordes Supper.

In the first of these, two senses, true it is that A Communion was I can not saie, alwaies, but no inconuenience will folow if it be graunted that it was alwaies in the primitiue Church. And that it was very Common and Ordinarie, the heape of the Autho-

Authorities by M. Iewel reherſed, doe make for it.

In the ſecond: It was neuer knowen in the primitiue Church: And no One of al the places which M. Iewel hath gathered, doth conteine ſo much. Againe, concerning the firſt: The Argumēt is very falſe. For: euen at theſe daies, A Maſſe and A Communion doe agree in ſight together, at ſuch tymes as the People receiue with the Prieſt at the Altar.

Concerning the ſecond: the Argument is good but the Antecedent can neuer be proued: that in the Primitiue Church ſuch (a Single and Simple, and Irreuerent, and Dead) Miniſtration of the Diuine Myſteries was vſed then, as is taken vp in the Engliſhe Communion at this preſent.

Of M. Iewels Digreſsions.

CAP. II.

Concerning now ỹ other kinde of your cõmõ places, which I doe rightly call Digreſsions, they are ſo frequented of you, as though ye founde ſome ſpeciall Cumfort in them, after werineſſe take in other thinges: And they are ſo Outragious, as though you went not for a Biſhope of Sariſburie, but were ſome Slaũderous, Fumiſſhe, And vnlerned Protestant: And to the matter proponed they are ſo Impertinent, that you may Lawfully be charged with the fault, of increaſing your Replie with them. Haue you ſo much Leaſure (M. Iewel) to ſpend your labour, in Extrauagãtes? Or if your Leaſure ſerued you neuer ſo much, haue you ſo litle diſcretion, to occupie your tyme in naughtie and idle talke?

In your Anſwer, to D. Hardinges Preface, ſtraitewayes you peeke out of ỹ Gloſe, (which is nor Scripture nor Canon, nor Doctors ſentence) A Slaunder againſt the Pope: And to make ỹ matter more odious, you vtter it, as ſpoken by the Pope him ſelf

Iew. fol. 1 pag. 1

ſelf with his owne mouth, I can not err. &c. which in deed neither he euer ſayed, neither they which ſpake it of him, take in ſuch ſenſe as you doe imagine.

Fol. 2. pag. 2. In the ſame anſwer, you put D. Harding againe, in remembrance of the Pope, and you ſpeake your pleaſure of him, alleging A Gloſe for your authoritie.

Pagina 2. & 6. Of your Replie, Againe yow be vp with the Pope.

To what greate Purpoſe, Or vpon what Occaſion, your ſelf perchaunce doe know: but vnto vs, it ſeemeth an vnreaſonable and ſhamefull matter, to Accuſe anie Perſon, out of the Lawful Court, And to ſpeake againſt the Pope, Cardinals, Prieſtes &c. when other queſtions are to be handeled. Out of Reaſon and Reaſon.

Your part and dutie had ben, to anſwer vnto D. Hardinges Argumentes: And not to turne your mynde to finding of Faultes. Remember yet, how oft ye vſe that Lewde figure, of ſpeaking againſt Thinges and Perſons out of place: As,

Pag.		Against.	
	11		The Clergie.
	16		Confession, and Priestes.
	18		The Scholemen.
	24		The Ceremonies of the Church.
	39		The B. of Rome.
	40		The B. of Rome.
	52		S. Hierome, Tertullian, Origen, & against Reliques.
	56		Pope, Cardinals, Priestes.
	83		Miracles.
	92		Denont answers of Priestes.
	189		The Pope.
	195		Aultars of stone.
	204		The Clergie and Churche.
	220		The Pope.
	221		The Pope.
	225		The Pope.
	234		Bishopes and Priestes.
	236		The Pope.
	248		
	249		The Pope.

This maketh your Sermons plausible, and relysheth al your writinges

The

Pag			
	258	Against.	The Popes.
	259		The Pope, and Scholemen.
	262		The Pope.
	274		The Pope.
	275		The Pope.
	277		The Pope.
	278		Bonifacius the Pope.
	288		The Pope.
	289		The Bishope of Rome.
	297		The Pope.
	310		The Pope.
	317		Scholemen.
	313		The Pope.

How thinke we then, may this be called a Replie, (which is presupposed to folow the sayinges of ẏ aduersaries wᵗ a iust answer) Or an Infamous Libell rather (which the lighter the heade is, ẏ soner it inuenteth to make, æ vtter abrode at all aduenture?

Againe: Is it, thinke we, a litle space in a Boke, which is hable to conteyne so many Excursions, or Digressions? These surely, which I haue noted here, I finde within ẏ cumpasse of fower Articles only: Out of which, I know, I might gather many mo. If these digressions then, whith haue

a Speciall fling againſt the Pope of Rome, and ſometimes againſt the Clergie, amoũt to ſo Greate a nũber, And if theſe, by themſelues alone, muſt needes grow to ſome bigneſſe, (for Some of them continue halfe ẏ ſide, ſome ẏ whole, & Some almoſte a leafe, altogeather out of the matter) I neede not to reken vp any more, to confirme my Obiection: and by theſe few, in reſpect, the wiſe may ſone gather, what maner of old endes and Shreddes, M. Iewells new Boke is ſtuffed withal.

But now, as in the foreſaied Common Places, it was ſtraitwaies perceaued with out further declaratiõ, ẏ they were cõmõ in deed, & might ſerue the Catholikes, as wel as the Protеſtantes: So in theſe, of which we ſpeake, though I ſay it, yet that doth not proue it, that they be digreſſions. How then? muſt I goe through all and ſhew, how they belong not to the queſtion proponed? That would be to long and tedious. Shall I refer all to the Readers Diligence? Yet would not that ſatiſfie either M. Iewell (if he diſdained it not) Or Some other, whoſoeuer would take it vpõ him, but that it ſhould be anſwered: I bring in my Obiections in A Mummery, and

and Dolosus versatur in generalibus, He that walketh in Generalities, walketh not plainly. Briefly therefore, I will bring furth foure or fyue Examples, that if M. Iew. cã proue thẽ to be no digressions, I may be licensed to Replie: And if he can not honestly denie thẽ to be so, ẏ then he amend that fault, and speake more to the purpose hereafter. Iew. 161

D. Har. by way of naturall reason saieth thus in effect, *ẏ if God had ordeined, ẏ in ẏ Church should be sundry heades & Rulers, and none to be constituted to be ouer other*, then he should seeme to haue set vp a Confusion and an Anarchie, (which is, the destruction of all Common weales) But he is most wise, & most tender also ouer his Church: ergo, he hath (by all likelihode) appointed her one Heade & Gouernour. Ergo the Supremicie of one man the successour of S. Peter and Chiefe of all Bishopes, must not be thought absurde. what answer you to this reason, M. Iew? Har. fol. 109.

You tell vs of A speciall Glose of Petrus Bertrandus vpon the Decretales, that: Non videretur Dominus discretus fuisse &c. Our Lord should haue semed not to haue ben discrete & puident (that I may say it with reuerence Iew. 258 The first Example of an Absolute Digression.

rence of him) except he had left one such vi-
care behind him.

Yow gather further, out of ꝑ same Glose, Christo data est omnis potestas &c. Al maner power in heauē and earth is geauen to Christ: therfore the highest Bishope which is his vi-care, hath the same power.

Againe, ye add more Gloses, that: Papa po-test facere omnia, quæ Christus ipse potest. the Pope may doe, what so euer Christ hym-selfe may do. **And,** Papæ & Christi vnū est tri-bunal, ꝑ Pope & Christ haue one Cōsistorie.

And not content with this, you allege an extrauagant, that speaketh of a Closet in the Popes brest, and you tell vs of one: Whose pleasure may stand in steede of a Law, vnto whome what so euer he doe, no man may say: Domine, cur ita facis? Syr, why doe you so?

And last of all, when you had ended now, with Gloses & Canons not understāded of you, you bring, out of ꝑ closet of your owne brest, a certaine descriptiō of a straūge Offi-cer: that neither doth exhorte nor teach nor minister Sacrament, nor exercise discipline, nor doth ꝑ dutie either of Bisshop, or of priest Or of deacō, or anie other the meanest officer of ꝑ Church: but only taketh vpō him to Rule & Gouerne the whole Churche. **And so, wh much a doe, endeth ꝑ Digression, without**

anie

Ye neded not to haue gone out of your waie to run so furth at length in so most shameful and open lying.

anie begynning at all made to the answer of ỹ argumẽt. which, I praie you to cõsider.

Is it not reason, M. Iew. ỹ for auoiding of Confusion, which quikly ariseth in a multitude, where no Order is, ỹ One be Chief ouer all? Bertrandus (sae you) hath a Special glose &c. What haue Diuines to doe with Bertrandus glose? Answer you the text of the Argument. Iew. 258

Likewise they say, Papa potest facere omnia &c. That is an other glose, but why tell you vs thereof, and vtter not rather a parte of your aduise concerning ỹ quiet Gouerning of ỹ Church? Again, Papæ & Christi vnũ est tribunal &c. They ỹ say it, know in what true sense they say it. But what is all this to our question? Now, as for ỹ Closet in ỹ Popes brest, & Domine, cur ita facis, except your self be he, to whom no man must say, Syr, why doe you so? we may iustly oppose you in it, Syr why made you this digression? And because ye cã geue no reason for it, thinke, ỹ a Closet would doe you good in your brest, to kepe your wittes nearer together. Iew. Iew.

Another Exãple of a needlesse digression is to be seen pagin. 288. For, whereas D. Harding had sayed, that Athanasius and The second example.

Paulus

Paulus, being deposed by the Arrians assisted w the Emperour Constantius, were restored to their roomes againe by Julius ỹ Pope, M. Iew. appealeth to ỹ iudgement & discretion of his Reader, ỹ it is vnlikely. And why so? He answereth:

Iew. 188

For neither was Bonifacius the 8. Yet borne, ỹ determined, that the Emperour should be inferiour to the Pope: Nor Pope Innocentius the third, or his Glose, that rated the matter by good Geometricall proportion, and pronounced, that the Pope, is fyfty & seauen degrees aboue the Emperour, euen iust as much, as the Sonne is aboue the Moone: Nor Pope Alexander the third, that set his foote in the Emperours necke.

Fine for Iewels.

A fine digression, a grosse Reason. Haue you not readen, M. Iewell, that S. Ambrose controlled the Emperour? Doth not S. Chrysostome say, that as the Soule excelleth the Body: so doth a Priest passe in dignitie, a Temporall Kinge? Yet was neither Bonifacius the 8. nor Pope Innocentius the third borne at those dayes. What new kinde of Logike is this? Bonifacius was not borne, when Julius lyued: ergo it is not likely, ỹ Julius did restore Athanasius to his roome, frō which heretikes, w ỹ

Hist. Ec. lib. 9. ca. 30.

Chrys. li. 3. de Sacerd.

Empe-

Emperous fauor, had pulled him downe.

Again, there was no Glose then to rate ỹ degrees of ỹ magnitude of the Sõne aboue ỹ Moone, & applie it to ỹ Pope & Emperour: ergo ỹ Pope & ỹ Emperour are not of vnlike quãtitie, iust (I trow) as the Sõne & Moone are both of one bignesse. If this be tru, thẽ haue you directly ãswered: but seing it is false, then haue you Idelly wandered. New found Logyke.

But let vs see an other Example. When I heare) sayeth M. Iewell) M. Hardinge to geue vnto the Bishope of Rome a power peerlesse (what doe ye then? Prepare your self, by likelyhode, to Answer him. No, no, you haue other matters to thinke vpon) me thinketh (say you) I heare Doctour Durandus say: Hic est Melchisedech &c. This is Melchisedech whose priesthode is not comparable vnto others. He is the head of all Bishopes, from whome al they descend, as membres from the head, and of whose fulnesse al they receyue. Me thinketh I heare, that is written by the Canonistes: Dominus Deus noster Papa, Our lord God the Pope. Iew. 151 A thirde Example.

In this point I beleue you wel M. Iew. For, as to S. Hierome and other (whose thoughtes and mindes were still vpon God) Hiero.

God) that Trumpet of the last day seemed to haue sowned alwaies in their eares: so to you, which haue such affection to ỹ Gloses vpon ỹ Canon law, as though your Chiefe Armour & Treasure were in thẽ in making war against ỹ Supremicie, Doctour Durand, or Hostiensis, or Petrus Bertrãdus, or ỹ Glose vpõ Vnam sanctam de Maioritate & obedientia, are so nigh at hart wt you & so ready in your memory: ỹ for respect of them you forgett ỹ present question: And D. Har. speaking vnto you, it seemeth to you it is Doctour Durand. Verily M. Jewell, this is but your thinking, And whether it be through your much Studie, and emptinesse of heade, or through egrenesse of Stomake and abundance of Choler, that you be so distracted: the truth is, D. Har. neither saied it, nor alluded in anie parte vnto, Dominus Deus noster Papa, that you might thinck your selfe to heare in him the Canonistes speaking. But you had a fansie to bring in those wordes: And for that cause, no Occasion being genen by D. Har. your owne Thought was your Guyde and warrant, that you might seeme yet to haue some mention made vnto you of D.

Whether doth M. Jewel meditate vpon Glosses for deuotion or knowledge Or Charities sake.

Durand

Durand and the Canoniſtes: leſt your digreſſion ſhould haue ben to manifeſt.

Now one Example more, and then an end of this Chapiter. D. Harding to proue that the Publike Seruice of England was in Latine, when it was conuerted firſt vnto the faith, he bringeth furth one Iohn Archechaunter of S. Peters Church at Rome: which was therefore interteined in England, that he ſhould teach the courſe of Seruice for the whole yere, as it was done at S. Peters in Rome. Of which this muſt folow by all reaſon, that if the Church Seruice in England had ben in Engliſh: An Archechanuter of Rome, ſo great A Stranger, had ben nothing a meete Perſon to teach naturall Engliſhmen, to Singe, write and Reade in their owne Naturall Tongue. But this witneſſe, ſayeth M. Iewell, cometh to Late. How much to late? Mary fower ſcore yeres. For Iohn the Archechaunter Liued in the tyme of Pope Agatho in the yere of our Lord 680.

Well this is hard dealing: but hereof we ſhall ſpeake in an other place. In the meane

meane season, Iudge thou now indifferent Reader, and speake freely, hath M. Iewel any occasion geuē here vnto him, to medle with the Popes Decrees or Gloses vpon them? None at all. For the Argument against him comprehendeth no more, but, that the Latine Seruice was in England at ỹ begynning: and his answer stretcheth no further, then to the plaine refusall of the witnesse brought in, because he liued without the cumpasse of the sixe hundred yeres after Christ. And this once saied he is at an end.

Iew. 189

Yet see, what a tale he will tell thee. For Iohn the Archechaunter (sayeth he) lyued in the tyme of Pope Agatho, in the yere of our Lord 680. in whose name this decree is written. Sic omnes sanctiones Apostolicæ Sedis &c. Al the constitutions of the Apostolik see must be receaued so, as the if they were confirmed by the very heuenly voice of S. Peter. Vnto such a tyrannie the Church of Rome at that tyme was growen. And the glose vpon the same saieth: Papa sanctitatem suam recipit a Cathedra. The Pope receaueth his holynesse of his Chaire. Therefore herein M. Harding somewhat misrekened him selfe.

As much to the matter as the making of a Canon to the taking of a iorney Or the singe at yorke to the sense of a Rubrike in Law.

wherefore I praie you? Because of the forsayed Decree writen in Pope Agatho his

his name? Or the saying of the Glose thervpon? No, it is plaine that you conclude, D. Harding to haue misreckened him selfe, because that Pope Agatho lyued in the yere of our Lorde 680. and Iohn the Archechaunter was of the same tyme. Howe now then? Doe you proue, by the decree and Glose which you full solemly haue alleaged, that Pope Agatho lyued in the yere of our Lord 680? But there is no mention of such matter in them. Wherefore then haue you brought in the Decree and the Glose? You dissemble your Arte, or els the consequence and hanginge of this geare together (if any at all had bene) woulde haue appered.

But in dede, there lacked a poynt of plaindeling. For whē you had once named Pope Agatho, you should haue vsed a Therefore or some such like saying: Because I haue mētioned Pope Agatho, therfor I wil tel the (gētle Reader, what Decree was writen in his name, and what the Glose vpon the same saieth. In like phrase, as a certaine Preacher, after he had declared the fall of Adam, taken by the eatinge of an Apple: Now good people (sayed he) because I haue tolde you of an Apple, which is an Indifferent thing: lette

vs speake of the fast in Lent.

Now, if you disdain (M. Iewel) to vse this Therfore of my prompting, & tie your tale together wᵗ it: there is no cause why we may not infer a worse against you. I meane this: You haue therefore gone so ofte byside the right waie, to speaking of Glosses and Canonistes, either of a feruent Passion of Malice againste the Catholike Faith, which made you alwayes greedie of disgracing it, Either of a vaine loue towardes your owne prayse, which itched you forwarde, to vtter your much reading.

Expound your own meaninge, if we M. Iewel haue misled.

Againe, the Places which you, so ofte and thicke, doe bring againste the Pope, are odious at the firste hearinge: but when they shall be Considered and Answered, either they shall be founde not to be so as you reporte, either els to haue a true and Christian sense in them. Therefore to presse vs wᵗ them, out of Place & Season, that we should not intend to answer thē, that they, so passing away, for the present, without Answer, might hinder our cause in the iudgement of many a Reader, it was craftely done and vnhonestlye. As, on the other side, if you (God wote) meante no harme at all, but without all immoderate

Affection

Affection or Crafty cumpasse, went plainely and directly forwarde in your matters, only that your Replie might be full: then haue you done grossely and vnorderly. To be shorte, whatsoeuer, and howsoeuer the causes be, the Indifferent Reader may iudge of ỹ Effect, and perceaue that they are vndoubted Digressions, whiche you haue made from the question, to Canons and the Glosses vpon thē, and which I burden you withall.

And I burden you herewithall, so much the more iustely and earnestly, because your selfe are so Rigorous, vppon lesse Occasion or none at all, against D. Hardinge. M. Iew. findeth fault with digressiōs

For when he, in the Article of Priuate Masse, did put it as a sure Ground: that the Masse or Unbloudye Sacrifice, was so manye wayes to be Proued, that you coulde not withstande the Catholykes therein, And towched shortelye in a Leafe and a half, the Authorities which dydde serue that Purpose, of whiche he might haue made A Juste Treatise, and neuer haue gone byside hys Purpose: yet that litle whiche he spake greeueth you so much, that you say: Hard. Fol. 25.

Iew. p 12 It is a ſimple kinde of Rhetorike, to vſe ſo large digreſſions frome the matter, before ye once enter into the matter.

As who ſhould ſay, that the Author of a Treatiſe might not take what Order he would: Or that to ſpeake of the Maſſe, were an Impertinent thinge to Priuate Maſſe, Or that in the diſcuſſing of a compound it were not lawfull, to open the nature of ỹ ſimple: Or, when two things are at one tyme (yet couertly) impugned, to ſhew that the one of them ſtandeth vppon ſure ground, thereby to diſcumforte the Aduerſarie.

After like ſorte of quarrelling, whereas D. Harding concluded, that:

Single Communion was not only
Hard. 38. *ſuffered in tyme of perſecution, but alſo allowed in quiet & peaceable tymes euen in the Churche of Rome it ſelfe, where true Religion hath euer bene moſte exactly obſerued & cæt.*

M. Iewel greately offended herewith all, and mcrueilinge (as it were) at the Matter:

Iew. 56. But why doth M. Hardinge (ſayeth he) thus

thus out of reason, rush into the Church of Rome that was longe agoe?

But, why say you so M. Jewel? Doth not the Argument, which he maketh, require that he should commend that See? For Rome itselfe allowed (sayeth he) priuate Masse: ergo it is the lesse to be douted of. Whiche Argument because it will at these dayes seeme the worse, the more that it dependeth of the Authoritie of that See: could he doe lesse, then bring one testimonie in the praise thereof? and call you this a Rushing in thereto out of season? But what should he haue done by your fyne aduise?

Mary, say you: It had bene more to the purpose to haue vewed the state of the same Church as it standeth now.

See the malice to speake ill of Rome, he taketh it to be to some purpose, and to speake wel therof he cõpteth it out of season.

Had it so? And you being so Maliciously and wickedly disposed, would the Authoritie thereof, as it is now, haue preuailed with you? Lette anie indifferent man be Judge, whether it had bene aptlye done of D. Harding, in warrantinge of Sole Receauinge as alowed in Rome, to commend ẏ Consequẽce by telling the faults which may be founde in that Citie nowe, rather then the testimony of the Bishopes

of all Gallia: whiche within the six hundred yeres after Christe, acknowleged, that from thence came the Fountaine and spring of theyr Religion.

Againe, let any Indifferent man iudge, whether M. Iewell hath Answered this prayse of the Bishoppes of Gallia geauen so longe agoe vnto the Churche of Rome, by his Accusinge of Bishoppes, Cardinales, and Priestes: Or by Lamentinge the case of Rome as S. Bernarde dyd, Or by makinge of Prouerbes vppon it, as Euripides sometyme dyd of the Citie of Athens.

Is this the liberty of the Gospell, or the Charitye of your Spirites?

Surely in this very place, where without cause he reproueth his Aduersaric for commendinge out of season (as he iudgeth) the See of Rome, it is a greate shame to Rushe into Discommendation of Bishoppes, Cardinals and Priestes attendinge vppon that See: And to like it better to Examine and Iudge the Present state of Rome, then to remember the Auncient Dignitie and Vertue thereof, to confirmation of suche pointes, as in those dayes were by it alowed,

Other places and Signes there are,

one

out of which I doe gather, that M. Iewel can not abide Digreſſions, as when he ſayeth:

This Queſtion is out of courſe. Iew. 149

We may well ſuffer M. Hardinge to wander at large in matters that relieue him nothing. If it were lawfull for others ſo to doe, it were no greate Maſterie to write Bookes. 153.

Again: Theſe be none of the maters, that lie in Queſtion.

M. Harding maketh a longe diſcourſe of the Apoſtles & cæt. If he had ſhewed to what end, we might the better haue knowen his purpoſe. 155.

But to what end? For neither, it is denied of vs, nor it is any part of our queſtion. 160.

Which thinge neither is denied by me, nor any wiſe toucheth the queſtion. 180.

By theſe I am perſuaded, that he would haue ỹ matter it ſelf folowed, and loueth not to haue the time idelly beſtowed.

Nowe though I am hable to declare, that Doctour Hardinge in theſe pointes hath done no otherwiſe then he lawfullye might: Yet to lette that paſſe, I Conclude againſte Maſter Iewell, that of all

Vnequall measure.

thinges it is most Absurd in him that is so Precise with other, to be wide and large towardes him selfe in the selfe same kinde of thing, for which (though vniustlye) he reproueth other.

Iew. 153.

And if, as M. Iewel confesseth, it be no great mastery to wryte bookes, if it be lawful to wãder at large in matters that relieue not: Let no man wonder at the worthynesse of him, which hath wrytten so mighrye a Reply, considering that he runneth so far into Common Places, and Rusheth so fowlye, into dispraise of Popes, Cardinals, Priests and Church of Rome: whiche neither maketh the new Gospellers the honester mẽ, neither destroieth the Present and Auncient faith of the Catholike Church.

¶ Of a thirde kinde of Common Places, worse then any of the foresaid two.

CAP. III.

TO proue by examininge of sundrye wittesses, A Truthe which is either plaine by it selfe, Or els by the Aduersary confessed, it is an idle spending

ding and prolonging of tyme, to the shame of the party that vseth it: And no hurt at al to the vnderstanding of the Iudge or the Court, by troubling them with some dout or errour. For in laboring to perswade but a Trueth, which euery man oughte to cleaue vnto, be the vnderstanding neuer so closelye vnited therevnto by fulnesse of perswasion, it can be no sinne or daunger to stand fast by that, which not to assent vnto, were reprouеable. And therefore, sauing for other circumstances, of Subtelrie or Vanitie vsed therein, M. Iewel is not hurtfull to any poynte of true Faithe and Religion, in his folowing of those Common Places, of which I haue spoken all ready.

On the other side, when an Heretike goeth from the matter that he hathe taken in hand, to Accuse, and Condemne, and bring into hatred, Popes, Cardinalles, Priestes. &c. by gathering in of Rumors, by folowing of Suspitions, and setting open vnto the world the worst that he can speake of the Clergy: This, although it be Vniustly, Proudly, and Uncharitably don, yet doth it not greatly touche in any parte our Faith or Religion. For if all were true

that

that is fained vpon Popes, Cardinals and Priestes: Or if nothing be false, of that which their Enemies reporte, of some of them, what foloweth then? No more surely, than that suche Persons are offenders, and that the faultes of the Clergy are to be Corrected. And I pray God be mercifull vnto his Church, that either no Crimes be found among the worthier members of it, Or iust Canons and lawes may be executed, suche as allready are made for the purpose.

But let these thinges be, as they may or will be, who hath made Englishmen Iudges ouer Romanes? Or who but the cursed Children, doe tell tales abrode of their Fathers Priuities? Againe, why should there not be Praying for Soules departed, because Some haue taken mony for it? Or whye due honor not geuen to Sacramentes, because some Sir Johns are irreuerent? It is not safe to leape out of the Arke, into the maine waters, because of some euil sent of men or beastes therin. Or to leaue the folowing of Christe, because Publicanes and Synners went in his companye.

The Apostleship is honorable, thoughe

Iudas

Iudas be a Traitor: And the Doctrine of him that sitteth orderlye in the Chaire, is pure and good, though the breathe whyche commeth from him doe sauoure.

These things therefore considered, let M. Iewel make Impure digressions, not sparinge to beraie his owne clothes in a fowle waye and intent, so that he may get some dust or durt, to hurle after ỳ heeles of Popes and Cardinals. Yet al this concerneth but maners only, and should not in anie Indifferent iudgement or meane discretion, remoue a Christian from the stedfastnes of his faith.

But nowe A thirde kind of Common Places which I finde resorted vnto of M. Iewel, Yea rather pointed out vnto vs by him, is so wide and so daungerous, that a man shall not only goe quickely out of his waye in folowinge them by him selfe, but also when God shall send him a Guide to conducte him in the way, he wil alwaies be vncertaine and doutful therof, through suche meanes as M. Iewel hath prouided.

It semeth that now at length, the long since intended Purposes of the Dyuel, are almost come to theyr perfection: And there lacketh

lacketh no more nowe, but that, by Open Apostasie, he make the faith of Christe to be forsaken: and that, not so much as the name thereof, shal be suffered in the world.

Speake I this without cause? Let any Indifferent man be Iudge. For take the fundations awaye frome an howse, and can it contynue any space together? Take all credite awaye, betwixte man and man in this trade of life, and will there be left any Occuppying to and fro? If no Authoritie and law be in a Common wealthe, can the state thereof endure? what is that among Christians which hath brought them vnto the Faith, and Staied, and Gouerned them in it? Is it not the Authority of the Churche, Commending the Doctrine of Christ vnto vs, By Fathers, By Councels, By Custome and Tradition, And by Succession of Bishoppes euen from S. Peter hitherto? Emong all which, if no one, may safely be leaned vnto, what remaineth in all the world worthye of credite? And except there be an Authoritye and Order, which we may and must folow, what Faith can we haue at all?

Preparation for ye Antichrist

But who is he, that prepareth suche waies for the Antichrist? Or who shaketh the

the Hartes and Consciencies of Christians, euen from the very botome and foundations of them? Mary, except you BEWARE of him, M.Iewel emonge other, is he. And either he keepeth yet still in store, some secrete Reuelatiõs, by which perchaunce he will perswade the worlde, (which is incredible) Or els (As farre as we may gather by his Reply) neither him selfe hath any Faith, neither will suffer any other to be quiet in it.

Like a Rhetorician, which for Glorie or Gaine sake, feareth nothing so much as to be found Tongetied in any matter, especially professing to speake aptly and copiously in euery matter, And to that end promideth his Common places to be in a readinesse.

For witnesses and Against witnesses: For Rumors and againste Rumors, For trying oute a matter by Racking, and Against racking:

So hathe M.Iewel done. He hathe brought Diuinitie downe to Rhetoricke, And, as though the kingdome of God consisted in Talke, and not in Vertue and Power, Diuinitye brought to Rhetorike

Power, so doth he shewe vnto his diligent Readers, the Arte how to weake the Aduersaries staies and Authorities, and in answering all other men, yet for their owne partes neuer to be answered. And to this end, serueth thys worst kind of Common Places, of which I geue thee (Indifferent Reader) faire warning. As in example, For Custome, against Custome: For Fathers, against Fathers: For Councels against Councels: For Vnity, against Vnity: For Ceremonies, against Ceremonies: For Miracles, against Miracles. In which how M. Iewel hathe furnished hym selfe, let it firste be declared, and then afterwarde Considered.

For Custome.

If he doubt S. Paule, yet the verie practise
Iew. 101. and continuall Order of the primitiue Churche, fullie declareth what Christe mente.

And they say:

Consuetudo est Optima Interpres Legum.

Custome is the best Interpreter of the Lawe.

Si

Si De Interpretatione legis quæratur. &c.

If queſtion happen to be moued, touching the meaning of a Law, firſt of all we muſt ſee, what order hathe bene vſed in the like Caſes in times paſt. For the Cuſtome and practiſe of the people, is the beſt expounder of the Lawe.

De legibus et Senatusco ſulto & Longa Conſue. Si de.

Againſt Cuſtome.

THe Reaſon that S. Baſile maketh of Cuſtome and continuaunce, being wel conſidered is very weake, bothe for many other good and Iuſt cauſes, and allſo the ſame Cuſtome, as it was neuer Vniuerſally receiued, ſo vpon better aduiſe by Order of the Churche, it was cleane aboliſshed. For wiſe men in Goddes cauſe haue euermore miſtruſted the Authority of Cuſtome. The Heretikes in old time named Aquarij, that in the holy Miniſtration vſed Water onlye, and no Wine, notwithſtãding they manifeſtly brake Chriſtes Inſtitution as our Aduerſaries do nowe, yet they vphelde their doinges therein, by Long Cuſtome. But S. Cypriane being then aliue, wrote thus againſt them.

Iew. 49.

It is vtterly vntrue: for in his Epiſtles, ad Iubaianũ, Quirinum, Põpeiũ.

Victi

he speketh not against aquarios but against the Catholikes, whiche by Custome and Traditiõ confuted his Opinion concerninge Rebaptizing of them, whom the Hereti kes had baptised before.

97

Victi ratione Opponunt Consuetudinem, quasi Consuetudo sit maior Veritate. & cæt.

Being ouercome with Reason, they defende them selfe with Custome, as though Custome were better then the truth. We maie not prescribe of Custome, but we must ouercome with reason. Custome without truth is the Mother of errour.

If ye allow Tertullia, whi goe your maidens with open face: If ye allow hym not, whye vse you his Testimony?

Consuetudo, Initium ab aliqua Ignorantia vel simplicitate sortita, in vsũ per successionem corroboratur. Sed Dominus noster Christus veritatẽ se, non consuetudinẽ, cognominauit &c.

Custome either of simplcitie, or of Ignoráce, geating once an entrie, is inured and hardened by succesion, and is defended against the truth. For Christ our Lord called himself Truth, and not Custome. Let them take hede therefore, vnto whome the thinge seemeth new, that in it self is old. It is not so much the Noueltie of the matter, as the Truth that proueth an Heresye. Whatsoeuer sauoreth against the truth, it is an Heresie, be the Custome thereof neuer so old.

These foresayed Places are Pro & Con. This that foloweth, I can not tel where to sette

set it. whether, emong those that make for Custome, or against it. But as I find it, so shal you haue it.

S. Augustine in this Case is very reasonable. his wordes be these: Vbi Authoritas desinit, ibi Consuetudo Maiorum Pro lege tenenda est: where Authoritie faileth. This seemeth in some Case to make for Custome. But Consider what foloweth in M. Iewel. But hauing Gods worde and CHrists Institution, we want no Authoritie. In what steede then shal any Custome stand vs, where the rudest Protestant in A whole Countrie, wil crake and bost of it, that Gods worde is his warrant in al his procedinges? But let vs goe to an other place. Iew. 143

For Fathers.

COncerning Auncient Fathers we commend them sufficiently, when we defend them ernestly, Or speake of them reuerētly. And there needeth not a Texte for their praise, owt of the Scriptures or Auncient Historie, when our selues doe actually

tender their Integritie of Estimation, And speake many faire and good wordes of them. So doth M. Iewel:

Sometymes Complainyng or sorowing that thei are not rightly alleged. As,

Iew. 26. For proufe hereof M. Harding allegeth the Authoritie of Dionysius wherein he doth Hypocrite Greate wronge to that GOOD OLD FATHER, &c.

Sometymes requiring thē to be brought furth and beleued: As,

Iew. 23. The mater being so weightie, and not yet thoroughly beleued, it had ben good for M. Harding, to haue made profe thereof, by the authoritie of S. Augustī. S. Hierome or some other OLD CATHOLIK Doctours.

At an other tyme, Gentelly intreatyng the Reader to consider the place of the Doctour, and so sweetly leading hym by reasonable request, that he can not chuse but conceiue much of the worthines of the Father. As,

Iew. 269 Good Christian Reader, Yf thou haue Chrysostome peruse this place, and weigh wel his wordes: If thow haue hym not, yet be not ouerhastie of beleife.

At an an other tyme againe: Vehemently

ly inueighing against his Aduersarie, as though he dyd not esteme the Fathers. which although D. Harding in that place doe not, yet M. Iewel, in takyng hym vp for it, as if he had done it, declareth thereby his Zelous Affection towardes them: As,

I alleged the saieing of S. Basyle: That the Church &c. The saieing of S. Hierome: That the noise &c. Lykewyse the saieing of Chrysostome: Common Petitions &c. But WHAT THEN. saieth M Harding. Why WHAT THEN? Thinketh M Harding that the Authoritie of Arnobius, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Hierome. S. Chrysostome, And other holie Fathers is so light, that he is hable to blow them al awaie, with these two vaine Sillables, WHAT THEN? Iew. 169

To be short, when hymselfe directly esteemeth them, it moueth the Reader to thinke also wel of them: As in Example,

S. Augustine is verie REASONABLE. Iew. 143

Verily Gregories Authoritie in this case were right good, if he would saie the word. 188.

It is S. Ambroſe Interpretation. with
199. other lyke Phraſes.

To this place it maye alſo be referred, when he craueth erneſtly for the expreſſe wordes of the Fathers: As,

Iew.148. If the holy Fathers had ſo belewed, they had wordes, and were hable to vtter it.

302. Was there no man then in the world, for the ſpace of ſix hundred yeres, hable to Expreſſe his name?

As though he would ſaie: Al the olde Fa-
306. thers of the Churche, bothe Greekes and Latines wanted wordes and Eloquence, and either they could not, or they durſt not Cal the Head of the Church by his owne peculiar name.

As who ſhould ſaie that M. Iewel is ſo addicted to the Fathers, that if any one of them ſaie the worde, he Subſcribeth and yeldeth.

Againſt Fathers.

FAthers, becauſe thei are many in number, therefore to make the matter more eaſie for the Conquering of them, it ys politikely done, to ſet furth a General Exception againſt them except they appeere by

by a certaine daie, which is, before the 600. yere after Christ, shalbe gone or Expired. for in deede how M. Iewel taketh the six hundred yere, I can not yet redily tel. As: Iew. 113

Dionysius, one of late yeres, and therefore Lead awaie with many errours.

S. Bernard is A Doctour but of Late yeres: 116. Therefore his authoritie We must weigh the Lighter.

An other policie ys, to cause the Alleaging of Fathers to be generally suspected: As,

There ys no way so easy, to beguile the simple, as the name and countenance of Auncięt Fathers. The Arian Heretikes alleged for themselues, the Auncient Father Origen: the Nestorian Heretiques alleged the Councel of Nice: The Donatian heretiques alleged S. Cyprian: The Pelagian heretiques alleged S. Ambrose, S. Hierome, and S. Augustine. Iew. in his preface to the reader.

And Dioscorus the heretike, alleged Gregorius, Cyrillus, and Athanasius, and compleined openly in the Councel, euen in lyke sort, and as iustly, as M. Iewel doth now:

Ego defendo dogmata sanctorum Patrum: Ego illorum habeo testimonia, nõ obiter nec in trãscursu sed in ipsorũ In Con. Chalc. Act. 1.

libris posita. I maiteine the Doctrine of the holy Fathers. I haue their witnesses, not vttered by Chaunce, or by the waie, but writen in their bokes.

Also to deny the Authoritie of the testymonie is one waie: and is done sometymes boldly and iestingly. As, Concerning the Epistle of Athanasius to Felix, and certaine other Epistles, that be extant in his name.

Iew. 332. A scarcrow (saieth M. Iewel) stuft with straw, and set vpright, maie Seeme a far of to be A Man. Euen so a forger of lies and fables, prickt vp in the apparel of Auncient names maie seeme to the Ignorant An olde Catholike Father. Againe:

333. The maner of his vtterance is childisſh, and babling, emptie of mater, and ful of wordes without measure. The substance of the whole is nothing els but flattering. &c.

Sometymes againe couertly and courteously: As,

Iew. 264 The Decretal Epistle, that is abrode vnder the name of Iulius semeth to sauor of some corruption

212. Lykewyse: This Exposition of Chrysostom

ſtom is very ſtrange, and agreeth with few o- 303.
thers. **Againe:** Although this place of Chryſoſtome import not greatly (**as who ſhould ſaie, I would not care much to graunt al that he writeth**) Yet being wel ſhifted and conſidered, it maie ſeeme very ſuſpitions, as nothing agreeing, either with that went before, or with that foloweth after, but altogeather ſauering of ſome corruption.

Furthermore though the perſon of the Father can not be denyed, yet the Eſtimation of hym maie be hyndred. As:

This Auguſtine, whome M. Harding calleth Sainct, and ſome others, the Apoſtle of England, was not that Greate Lerned Father S. Auguſtine &c. but an Hypocrite, a ſuperſtitious man, Cruel, Bloudie, and proude aboue meaſure. Iew. 185

Againe: He wrote to Rome for reſolution of certaine queſtions &c. ſo Childiſſhe & ſo Rude that a man maie wel doubt, whether Auguſtine were ruder, or the people. yet S. Gregorie anſwered them without any ſuch miſty lying.

Item: Touchinge Victor that wrote the ſtorie of the Vandals, he is neither ſcripture, nor Councel, nor Doctour, nor writeth the Order or Practiſe of the Primitiue Churche. 310.

Againe. Vnto this superstition S. Hierome himself gaue greate Occasion, many times, both writing and speaking vnseemely of the state of Mariage. Now to make this mater moze likely, M. Iewel doth cunningly, to number hym emong other that were gyltie: As, In this errour were diuers of the Old lerned Fathers.

Iew.52.

Tertullian saieth, I Allow not Mariage. Origine saieth, No man can offer the continual sacrifice, vnlesse he be a Virgin. S. Hierome saieth: It is not good to touche a woman, Therefore it ys il to touche a woman. Vpon occasion of which errour the people sometymes forbare the Churches, where Martyrs were buried.

To conclude, there is a certaine figure of Replyinge, when in graunting vnto some mater, you secretely take it awaie againe? As,

Iew.136.

I maye not disgrace the credite of this storie, albeit in Sozomenus and Nicephorus, of bothe whome, the same is recorded, there be sundrie thinges that maie be wel filed.

By these helpes then, A yong Diuine shal

shal meetly wel be furnisshed to keepe his tongue occupied withal, least a suddaine silence should cast him into a Confusion.

For Old Councels.

TOuchinge the Authoritie of Councels, becausethei seeme often tymes to vary, Gelasius thought it best to take vp the mater thus: *In gestis Conciliorum &c. VVhen so euer Contrarietie of sentẽce, ys found in the Actes of Councels, Let the sentence of that Councel be taken, that hath the elder and better Authoritie.* Iew. 124 Dist. 50. Domi. sancto.

For Prouincial Councels, against the General.

GOD hath oftentymes restored his Churche, and reformed Abuses and Heresies, by particular conference, within seueral Realmes and Coũtries. As we see by these priuate Councels holden at Carthage vnder S. Cypriane: At Neocesaria in Pontus: At Ancyra in Galatia. And by other like without ani consent of a General Councel. So likewise saieth S. Ambrose, against Secundus and Palladius: Iew. 126

Palladius: *The Biſhopes of the Eaſt parte, and ſo the Biſhopes of ẏ weaſt, haue euer vſed ſeuerally to aſſemble themſelues together as occaſion was offered, And to reform their churches by themſelues, without trobling of the whole world.*

Not in contempt of the whole world.

Iew. 235 Conc. Aphric. cap. 6. *Si prouocandum putauerint. &c. If they thinke it needeful to appeale from their owne Biſhopes, Let them not Appeale, but only vnto Councels to be holden within the countrie of Aphrica.*

Againſt Councels.

TIberius being Emperour, when he heard of the wonderful workes ẏ were wrought by Chriſt in Iurie, thought therefore, he was a God, and promoted A Bil vnto the Councel, that Chriſt might be proclamed, and take for a God. But the Councel was otherwiſe bent, and would alow him for no God. Tertullian laugeth at their folie: his wordes be theſe: *Apud vos de humano arbitrio*

Iew. 18.

In Apolog.

Diuinitas

Diuinitas penſitatur &c. Emong you the diuinitie and ſtate of God, is weighed by mans Iudgment. Except God pleaſe man, God (emong you) ſhalbe no God. Now therefore, man muſt be Good and fauorable vnto his God. The Like folie ſeemeth to be in them, that thinke Gods Trueth to be no trueth, onleſſe the conſent of a Councel allow it for trueth.

Al this might be true, if the Holyghoſt had not promiſed vnto the Church to tary with it for euer, and to inſtruct it. Againe, Gods Trueth is trueth in it ſelfe: yet vnto vs it is not knowen, but by meanes. Now emong thoſe meanes, which is the moſt worthie? The text of the Scripture, which except ſome body tel me, I ſhal not know, in what eſtimation to haue it: ỹ repor of a few men of our owne pariſhe or Countrie? Or ỹ determinatiõ & cõſent of a general or pronincial Coũcel? I ſhould thinke, ỹ, ſeing we come to faith by meanes of mẽ whõ we credite, it were not amiſſe to harkẽ chiefly after ỹ voice of a general Coũcel, where, As greate authoritie & as worthie of credite is repreſented, as maie be poſſiblie found in al

the

the woꝛld. But M. Iewel is afeard o
a folie. and like a wyſe man, and ſuch as
woꝛketh ſurely, he careth foꝛ none but fo
God him ſelfe: and Let men tel hym wha
they liſt, he hangeth not vpon the Autho-
ritie of any of them al, Oꝛ of al together,
receuing of Gods owne mouth (I trow)
immediatly, that which confirmeth hym
in his faith and religion.

Iew. 207.

Cicero ſaieth very wel of hymſelf: *Nihil nobis opus erat lege, de quibus nihil eſſet actum legibus. To reſtore me from exile, I needed no Lawe, againſt whom there was nothing done by lawe.* So maie we likewiſe ſaie, we neede no Councel to reſtore Gods Truth, that was taken awaie from vs without a Councel. Euerie prince is bound in the whole, to ſee the reformation of his owne Church and Countri. Neither wil God hold him excuſed, if he ſaie, I wil tarye til al other Princes, and the whole world doe the Lyke. Ioſue that noble prince, when he had aſſembled al the tribes of Iſrael before him, thus he ſpake vnto them. *Si malum vobis videtur &c. If ye thinke it il to ſerue the Lord, ye ſhal*

Yf the Saxon Lyke one waie and the Palſgraue an other, maie both defend themſelfs by theſe Exãples and contemne what ſo euer Authoritie in Chriſtendome? Ioſue ca. 24.

haue

haue your choise, But I and my house will serue the Lord.

It pleased God to plant his Church in this Realme three hundred yeres, before the first General Councel was holden at Nice. The Lordes hand is not shortened. He is likewise hable nowe, to reforme, the same by his holie word, without tarieing for a General Councel.

Is it Lawful then, to refuse the Nicene Councel. euen in this respect only as it consisted of Chiefe heades and Gouernours of al Christendome.

For Antiquitie.

TErtullian saieth: *Hoc aduersus omnes Hæreses valet, id esse verũ, quodcunque prius &c. This marke preuaileth Against al Heresies: That is the Trueth, that was vsed first: That is false and corrupt, that was brought in afterward.* And therefore the holy fathers in the Councel of Nice made this general shoute, and agreed vpon the same, Τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς κρατεῖτω. *Let the Auncient orders hold stil*, referring themselues thereby, to the vse and order of the Primitiue Church. Contrarywyse, Valentinus Marcion, and other Lyke Heretykes, thought

Tertul. aduersus Praxeã.

thought themselues wisest of al others, and therefore vtterly refused, (as M. Harding and his felowes doe now) to stand to the Apostles orders. Thus Ireneus writeth of them: *Dicunt se, non solum presbyteris &c. They wil saie, ỳ thei are wiser not only then other Priestes, but also then the Apostles, and that they haue found owt the perfite trueth.*

Irenæus lib. 3. ca. 2.

Against Antiquitie.

Iew. 128 NOtwithstanding it appeare by S. Augustine, S. Cyprian, and others, that Infantes in the primitiue Church in sundrie places, were admitted to the holy Communion, yet AFTERWARDE vpon good aduyse, they were iustly removed from it, becaufe that benig in that age, they were not thought hable to examine and proue thẽselues, according to the doctrine of S. Paule, and so to eate of that Breade, and Drinke of that Cup.

1. Cor. 11

By this reckening then, they of the primitiue Churche, vnderstode not S. Paule so wel as the aftercummers. And so hath Tertullians taieing litle effect, how,

That

That is the Trueth that was vsed first. It wil serue also in this place, al that M. Iew. hath gathered: *Against Fathers and custome*, as aboue is declared.

For Vnitie.

GOD hath other waies and meanes (saieth M. Iew.) then by the Gouernement of the Bishopes of Rome, whereby he hath euer gouerned his Church, and preserued Vnitie. How proueth he this? Mary. S. Cyprian saieth, Ideo plures &c. Therefore there be many Bishopes in the Church, that one rūning, into heresies ỹ rest may help & repaire againe: *The Churche is preserued in Vnitie by ỹ cōsent of bishopes agreing in one.* And to this end S. Hierome saieth, as is before alleged: *Nouerint Episcopi &c. Let Bishopes vnderstād, that they ought to rule ỹ Church as al in one.*

Iew, 160

Cypr. lib. 3. epi. 13. lib. 4. epi. 9.

In epi. ad Titum cap. 1.

Against Vnitie.

IMmediatly vpō ỹ forsaied wordes, foloweth a Cōmō place against Vnitie. As if M.

if M. Iewel would plainely protest, that when it maketh any thing for his syde, then it shalbe alowed and praised, And ỹ when the aduersarie would turne it to his purpose, then shal it be litle or nothing worthe.

Iew. 260 As in example:

Hieron. contra Lucifer. anos. S. Hierome saieth: *Nomine vnitatis & fidei, Infidelitas scripta est. Infidelitie hath ben writen, vnder the Name of faith, and Vnitie.* So lykewyse saieth the wyse man. *In tanto viuentes ignorãtiæ bello, tot & tanta mala Pacem appellabant. VVhereas they Lyued in such a warr of ignorance so many and so greate mischiefs they called Vnitie.*

Sap. 14.

what remaineth then now to be folowed of certaintie? Or what staie shal there be for a right meanyng affection and troubled conscience? If no such hold is to be taken of Fathers, Councels, Custom &c. but that the Enemie wil make it to be forsaken vtterly, or daungerously doubted of: what Refuge is there left, or what Authoritie? Shal the Bishopes which are for the tyme, rule in the causes of Religion? That surely

is

is already so apointed by God, and that if it were otherwise, should chiefly be wyshed for and procured. But what hope is there to haue this graunted of M. Iewel? Or if at one time he wil yeld vnto it, at an other he will deny it. For sometimes he will haue all Bishops equall: And what order then can be set there, where no one is better then an other? Sometimes he will haue differencies and distinctions of Authoritie among them. Yet then how little shall that preuaile, when he wil not be obedient to that Authority? As in example,

For æqualitie of Bishops.

S. Hierome wryteth thus vnto Eugagrius. Iew. 25

Si Authoritas quæritur. &c. If we seeke for Authority, the world is greater then the Citie of Rome. VVhersoeuer there is a Bishop, whether he be at Rome, or at Eugubium, or at Constantinople or at Rhegium. &c. he is of like worthines and of like priesthode.

Iew.257. Becauſe we are not onely led inwardly by Gods Spirit, but allſo outwardly by our ſenſes, therefore hath Chriſt appointed not one man to be his Vicar Generall ouer all, but euery of his Apoſtles, and ſo euery Prieſt, to be his Vicar within his diuiſion. So ſaieth Euſebius B. of Rome.

Epiſt.3 *Caput Eccleſiæ Chriſtus eſt. &c. Chriſt is the heade of the Church: And his Vicares be the Prieſtes, that doe their Meſſage in the Churche, in the ſteede of Chriſt.*

Iew.266. Cyp li.1. Epi.3. *Euery Biſhop hath a portion of the Flocke allotted vnto him, whiche he muſt rule and gouerne, and yeld accõpt vnto the Lord for the ſame.*

For diſtinction emong Biſhops.

Iew.336. Conc.Aphric. Ca.105 *The Decrees of the Councel of Nice, haue committed bothe the inferioure clerkes, and alſo the Biſhoppes, vnto their Metropolitanes.*

The Fathers of the Councell of Aphrica haue

haue decreed thus, that the B. of the first See, be not called the chief of Priests, or the highest Priest, or by any other like title, but only the Bishop of the first See. Iew. 240 Ca. 6.

In the Councel of Cõstantinople it is wryten thus: Let the Bishops of Alexandria haue the charge only of the East, the honor of primaci euer reserued to the church of Antioch. Iew. 245 Const. 1. Ca. 2.

Moze to this place might be brought, out of M. Iew. wozkes, especially Pa. 250. 267. and. 286. But by what Primate, Patriarche, oz high Bishop would he be ruled, which putteth the Spirituall Gouernment of the Church, in the handes of Tempozall Princes, and maketh euery Bishop the Vicar of Christ? In such sozt, as if there were no higher oz better person then he, foz Authozity, in all the wozld. And therefoze in these poynts hitherto, there wil be no hold oz stay.

For Succession.

But perchaunce all thinges shalbe determined by Succession. Foz Irenæus sayeth: Iew. 277.

Presbyteris illis. &c.

We ought to obey the Bishops in the church that haue their succession from the Apostles, which together with the succesion of the Bi-

shoprike, haue receiued the certaine gifte of the Trnthe, according to the will of the Father. This in deede would serue, if it were cõsidered, but M. Iewel liketh it not. For in the next side before, he saith of ỹ Pope. &c

Against Succession.

Iew. 276. THey Feast and cheare them selues, and Smothe the world with vaine talke. But S. Ihon sayeth:

Matth. 3. *Nolite dicere. &c. Neuer say (Peter or) Abraham was our Father.*

Act. 20. S. Paule speaking of his Successors saith thus:

Equidem Scio. &c. I know, that after my departure from you, there shall Rauening wolues come amongest you, that shall not spare the flocke.

Dist. 40. Nõ est fa. *And S. Hierome sayeth: Non sunt sanctorum filij. &c. They be not euermore the Childern of holy men, that sit in the roomes of holy men.*

But notwithstanding all these foresaide perplexities and doubtes, at length I trow we

we shall come to some Resolution and quietnesse. For the word of God and the scripture shallbe the Iudge. And yet, here also is a great vncertainty. For M. Iewel, for the most part appealeth to ỹ expresse worde in the Scripture. His Reply is full of his bragges therein, and with suche faire promises the greater sort is seduced. One example in a matter so manifest is sufficient. As:

For the VVorde of God or Scripture.

SPeaking, of the Scholemens conclusyons about Christes presence vnder the formes of bread and wine, he sayeth:

We may not here accompt, what may be in either of them, by drift of vaine fantasie: but rather we ought to consider, what Christ in the first Institurion thereof did, and what he commaunded to be done. Iew. 99.

Here loe, he refuseth to haue the sense discussed, but sticketh to the bare text. But it wil not be allwaies so, as appereth by these Examples.

Againſt the VVorde of God or Scripture.

Iew. 117. CHriſt did not therefore ſo abaſe himſelfe to washe his Diſciples feete, to the intent they according to the letter, should doe the ſame, but in himſelfe to shewe them a perfite Example of humility. &c.

Math. 18 10. & 8 In like manner, Chriſt ſet a Childe before his Diſciples, and willed them all to be as Childern. He bad them to shake of the duſt from their Shewes, and to cary neither Rod, nor Scrip, about them, and to ſalute no man vpon the way: not, that they shoulde practiſe theſe thinges according to the rigoure of the wordes, but to the intent, that by the ſame, they mighte be induced to a deeper vnderſtanding:

Iew. 150. And S. Hieronme ſayeth.

Hieron. ad Gal. li. 3. ca. 5. *VVhoſoeuer vnderſtandeth the Scriptures, otherwiſe then the ſenſe of the holy Ghoſt requireth, by whiche holye Ghoſt the Scriptures were vvrytten, although he be not yet departed from the churche, yet he maye well be called an Heretike.*

The

The ſenſe rather and the meaninge of the Scriptures is to be taken, then the wordes. Iew. 198. Orig. ad Ro. ca. 3. li. 3.

To ſay, The word of God, only becauſe it is wryten or ſpoken, is auaileable of it ſelfe without vnderſtanding, is a Superſtitious and Iewiſhe kinde of foly. Iew. 211.

Let vs make nowe an end of this Chapiter, for there is no ende of queſtionynge and altering, as farre as is to be learned of M. Iewel. And my Deduction or Argument is ſhort. If the ſenſe of the Scripture, be the thing that is to be honoured and folowed: And if that Senſe is not to be perceiued of euerye one that vnderſtandeth the Grammatical conſtruction and expoſition of the wordes: we muſte learne it of ſome body biſide our owne ſelues. And they of whome we learne it, muſt be ſuche, as vpon whoſe Authoritye we may builde and neuer chaunge: But neither by Fathers, nor Councels, nor Cuſtomes, nor preſent ſtate of Biſhops, nor by the texte it ſelfe of the Scripture, that Authoritye can be eſtabliſhed (for by Maiſter Iewels accompte, neuer a one of them dothe fullye ſatiſfye in any mater) ergo we are left vpon this reckening alltogether vnquiet,

when the Sonne of man commeth, ſhall he fynde think you, faith vpon the earthe. Luc. 18.

and to seeking where to staye our Consciencies.

Is not this a perfecte Religion? Or is not this a skilfull Professor of it, by whome it is brought to passe that no Faithe at all, can be appoynted vnto vs?

The Catholike yet, may sone be in quiet. For obeying that visible Churche, of which the Pope is a visible heade, he leaueth to the determination of it, all thinges perteining to Councels, Customes, Fathers and Scriptures. But these felowes, that know not, what to followe or forsake, but by the Testimonye of Councels, Customes, Fathers. &c. and yet dare not fully trust those selfe same thinges or persons which are their guides: what a miserable case are they in, cõcerning them selues, and how Artificially, doe they take Faithe, cleane away in some, and weaken it exceadingly in other?

BEWARE therefore of them by time (Indifferent Reader.) And concerninge the stedfastnesse which should be of Faithe, be not made alltogeather Indifferente, throughe this laste and worste kind of M. Jewels Common Places.

Thus

Thus hauing declared euidently, that M. Iewells greate boke in Quantitie, is of small matter in substance, and, that his Common places and Digressions are so many, that his straite folowing of the question, and his direct Answers to the purpose must be sone reckoned: I trust, the Indifferent Reader will BEWARE of him, and not muche maruell at that Boulke, where litle Corne is sure to be found: Nor thinke those vessels to be ful, whose bourdes are longe, and whopes of greate cumpasse. Now, to make his behauiour more plaine yet and manifest, let vs come to certaine other Specialties, and loke more particularly into his boke. And firste, it shalbe worth the while to consider, how M. Iewell hath ordered D. Harding:

In Peruerting his meaninge, 1.
In disgrating his Authorities, 2.
In wranglinge with him, 3.
In Dissimbling and butting with him, 4.
In Refelling one truth by an an other, 5.
And in Courteous (as they say) Reportinge of him: 6.

which ended, I wilcome, in ỹ third boke, to other men: as, Auncient Fathers, Later Doctours, and so furth, shortly prouing it

vnto

vnto thee (Indifferent Reader) that M. Iewell hath so abused him selfe, And thee, And them all, more or lesse, one waye or other: that he will neuer be able to saue his honestie. First then concerning the firste pointe.

That M. Iewel peruerteth D. Hardinges meaning.

CAP. 4.

I will leaue it to thy further consideration (Indifferent Reader) leisuerly to examyne it by thy selfe, how much it maketh to the ending of controuersies, or bringing of these matters to some Issue, that such as be Doers therein, should diligently intend vnto the sense of the Aduersarye, and applie therevnto a iust and direct Answer. For if it be otherwise, the Obiection first of all, remaineth vnanswered: And then, new matter of disputation and talke is ministred, through the peruersitie of the Answerer. Stomakes also doe rise, Bokes are multiplied, Readers wearied, And the further men goe forward, in the waye, as it were, of finding out the

pointe

pointe of the queſtion, the more intricate it is dayely made vnto them, by makinge and ſeeking of bypathes without the queſtion. If I would conclude that we are moued and warned not only by wordes but alſo by other Signes, And to that purpoſe would make mention of the bell, which warneth vs, either to come to Sermõs, either to attẽd more deuoutly at ſome ſpeciall tyme of the Seruice: If my Aduerſary in this caſe, would tell the Readers, that my meaning is to teach the people by a Bell rope, and to make one of the greate Bels in the Steple, A Preacher, and a leſſer one in the Quier a Deacon, to what purpoſe were our reaſoning, or what end were like to be, of ſuch a beginning? But as I ſayed, theſe thinges I leaue to thy further conſideration, chooſing rather by Examples to verifie my ſayeinges, then (as the indignitie of the matter requireth) to inueigh againſt this foule Demeanure of peruerting the Senſe of any mans ſayinges, which M. Iewel vſeth.

VVe are bounde to folowe Chriſtes Examples, Quoad ſubſtantiam, non quoad externam ceremoniam. Hard. 28

For the

the ſubſtance not for the outwarde Ceremonie.

Iew.22. The firſte Example. Here is great paine taken, to proue that Chriſtian men, in the miniſtration of Chriſts ſupper, are not boũd to folowe the Example of Chriſt. Againe: Why doth he defend his Sole Receauing, contrary to his owne wiſ-
33. ſhing, and cõtrary to the Example of Chriſt, as him ſelfe confeſſeth.

You ſay not truly. But contrarywiſe D. Hardinges concluſion is, that we are bounde to folow Chriſtes Example, And that we are not yet forbydde Abſolutely, from Sole Receauing, though Chriſt him ſelfe Receaued with cumpanie. Becauſe he did not that, for an Example, as beinge a mere Accident touching that whiche he then intended, no more then he meant to charge vs with Receauing in a Parlor, Or Chamber, Or at Night tyme only, Or Sittinge at ſupper, becauſe all theſe thinges are founde to haue bene obſerued of Chriſte, and therefore (as ſome frowarde Heretike might ſay) that we ſhould folow his Example.

Iew.27 nother Example. The Communion hath his name of the, effect, for that it ioyneth vs to God: Ergo ſaieth M. Harding, it ſignifieth not the Com-

muni-

municating of many together.

No he sayeth not so, but thus rather: Hard. 28

Ergo you can not thincke your selfe to haue an Argument againste, Priuate Masse, of the word (Communion) as though the Sacrament were called a communion, in consideration of many receauers togeather.

In which sense in deede, if it be a Communion, then is it no Priuate Masse. But, as the Truth is, and as D. Harding taketh the worde, it standeth well inoughe with Sole Receauing. And the partie receauing alone, is ioyned to God, and Communicateth with Christ the Heade, and his whole bodye.

Note further, that D. Harding made his forsayed Argument, to Answer yours (M. Iewel) whiche are so deceiued, that whereſoeuer you find mention of Communiõ, therupõ straitewayes ye cõclud against Sole Receauing, or Priuate Masse. Wherby it is euident, that you haue abused him much, & defiled your selfe not a litle, in reasoning, as it were in D. Hardinges name,

after

after this fashion.

Iew.30. It is called Cōmunion. { Ergo it maie be Priuate. Ergo it maie be receaued of one alone. Ergo the Priest may receaue it without Communicantes.

Iew.37. Againe: By the Communion all faithful are ioyned together: Ergo the Priest may saye Priuate Masse.

Iew.46. The iij. Example. Serapions boy ministred the Sacrament to his Master: Ergo Serapions boy said priuate Masse.

D. Hardinge sayeth not so, but:

Hard. Fol.34 *Ergo the Example of Serapion (which receaued alone) confirmeth our purpose of Single Communion.*

And note, that in this kind of Peruersion, M. Iewel continueth through the whole first Article, turning ẏ to saying of Masse, which D. Harding alleaged for proofe of Sole Receauing only, either in al conuenient tymes and places, Generally: either at Masse tyme and in the Church, Consequently.

The iiij. Example. D. Harding, in translating a testimony of S. Hierom making for Sole receauing, englished also a peece of Persius ẏ Poetes verse,

Verse, as he founde it in the Texte of his Author. Wherein, though he did but as faithfull Interpretours doe vse, yet M. Iewel, not only taketh it so, as if D. Hardinge of his owne heade, had put it in, but also, as though he meant to applie it to his purpose in the question of priuate Masse. His wordes be these:

Here, M. Harding interlaceth (no, he interpreteth only S. Hierome, and addeth nothinge of his owne) other matter of the office of wedlocke, the wordes of Persius the Pagane Poete, and the superstitious ceremonie of the Heathens, as I take it, litle perteining vnto his Masse. Iew. 51.

True it is (M. Iewell) Such geare perteineth no more to the Masse, then yoke felowes doe to Priestes, except both should be set to the Carte. And wherefore then doe you so speake, as though it were any part of D. Hardingts meaning?

It is a Sacrament of Vnitie: therefore if it be abused, we may seeke no Redresse.

It is nothinge lyke: but thus he concludeth: *Ergo let them take heede who moued by slender reasons for bothe kindes, doe rashly and dangerously cõdemne the Churche, for geuinge of it*

vnder

vnder one. For this in deed, is a manifest breach of vnitie.

Iew. 99. The fruite of the Sacrament dependeth not of the fourmes of bread and wine. Therfore we may breake Christes Institution.

The sixth Example.

The more Impiouse this conclusion is, the more wicked are you, to laie it to his charge, which at all hath none such. For thus he Reasoneth.

Hard. fo. 50. pa. 2. *The fruite of the Sacrament, dependeth not of the outwarde formes of bread and wine, but redoundeth of the Vertue of fleshe and Bloude of Christ, which vnder either kind is wholy and verely present. Ergo the church standeth vppon good groundes, in Ministring the Sacramēt, vnder one kynde vnto the people, by which no lesse fruit commeth vnto them, then if they receaued vnder bothe.*

The Priest consecrateth the Sacrament, and offereth the Sacrifice: Therefore the people is not bound to Receaued in both kyndes. Againe: The Church hath her libertie: ergo she is not bounde to Christes Institution.

Be not ashamed (M. Iewel) to reade D. Hardinges woꝛdes againe: And marke then whether you deale like an honest man with him, oꝛ no. The some of his discourse, is this: The Sacrament maie be considered 2. waies: Either as it is a Sacrifice, Oꝛ as it is a Sacrament.

Concerning the first, the foꝛmes of breade and wine bothe, are necessary, that the shedding of Chꝛistes bloude, And separating of his life from his body, may the better be repꝛesented. And in this part, D. Har. speaketh nothing, of the peoples Receaning: though in deede owt hereof, as owt of A Pꝛinciple, it could afterwardes be deducted, that ỹ people are not bounde to receane in both kyndes. But it maketh much to the purpose, to place euery thing aright: as, though your head be part of your body, yet to set that and your heele together, were no good fasshion.

Sacrifice.

Har. 51.

Concerning the second, because it is respected as meate, which the people doe receiue, to Pꝛeparation oꝛ Pꝛeseruation of Body and Soule into euerlasting life, in which meate the Substance, and not the Foꝛme is sought foꝛ, therefoꝛe the Church is at her libertie, (not to breake Chꝛistes

Sacrament.

Institution as you M. Iewel doe iangle) but to serue them, either with both kyndes, either one alone, as it shal seeme expedient.

Iew. 113. The 8. Example. Some men doe lothe wine, Some people cá hardly geat, some cá hardly keepe wine: ergo. there must be made a law general, ỳ ỳ whole world shal Communicate in one kynde.

D. Har. wordes are these, after ỳ forsaide causes alleged: *Ergo, it had ben byside reason, to haue bounde al to ỳ necessity of both kynds.* For there be two extremes, in the middle of which is the truth: *Al must receaue in both kyndes,* Is ỳ Protestãtes heresy: Against which, D. Har. in his place cõcludeth. *The whole world must receiue in one kynde,* Is an other heresy, which M. Iew. forceth here, vpõ D. Har. & yet he neither spake it, nor thought it, I am sure. ỳ middle & Catholik way is, ỳ, *It is an indifferent thing in it selfe, the Laye people to receiue in one or both kyndes,* And ỳ ỳ Churches order & counsel herein is to be solowed, without any further vaine bragging of Christes Institutiõ,

Har. 56.

Trueth in the middle of Extremes.

as

as though ỹ heretikes were ỹ expounders therof. Iudge therfore whether M. Iewel hath not in his place done like a ioly clark, so to mysconster a plaine sense & meaning.

M. Har. would haue vs put Gods word to daying, And none otherwise to be obedient to Christes Commaundement, then yt a few Bishopes gathered at Trident, shall allow it. The 9. Example. Iew. 121. Slaunderously.

who would not thinke, vpon this report of M. Iew. ỹ D. Har. had spoken blasphemie against God hymselfe. Yet he saied no worse then this: *VVe condemne not the Commmnion vnder both kyndes but cõfesse, it might be restored againe, by ỹ Authoritie of the Church lawfully assembled in a General Councel &c.* Har. 60.

And is there any harm in this? Specially being proued sufficiently ỹ ỹ Laie people to receiue in one or both kyndes, is not commaunded precisely & necessaryly by God? But this is a Generall peruersitie of M. Iew. through this whole Article, to burden the Catholikes with the Contempt of Gods word, and Christes Institutiõ, in ỹ they minister vnto ỹ Laitie, vnder one kind

whereas, to speake Indifferently, the matter is yet in controuersie, betwene vs and hym with his felowes: Or if it be certaine vnto them, that it is against Christes Institution, the contrarye is as certayne also vnto vs. So that it is very peuisshly done, to frame the Catholikes Argumentes, not according to that Principle which they followed in makinge them (As, that to Receaue in one kynd or both is Indifferent) but according to the measure of that heretical conclusion, in which the Catholikes doe withstand them, As, that, it is Christes Cõmaundement, ỹ people to receaue in both kinds.

The 10. example.

The breade which Christ blessed at Emaus, and gaue vnto his two Disciples, was the Sacrament, *And, as sone as they knew him in breaking of the bread, he vanished awaie from their sight, er ỹ he toke the cup into hys handes:*

Har.

Ergo, saith D. Harding, thei receiued in one kynd. But how taketh M. Jewel the Antecedent here: He maketh an Exclamation, Or he taketh an Indignation, Or he falleth into a Lamentation, Or surely he speaketh with much Affection. O (saieth he)

he) what miſerable ſtraites theſe men be driuē into. To make vp their tale, they are glad to ſaie, that Chriſt lackt leiſure. Iew. 125 Schoffer.

Sir, if you finde any ſuch blaſphemous worde, in D. Hardinges boke, I wil thāke you for geauing vs warning: but ſeeing there is none ſuch, what haſte were you in, to be ſo peruerſe and impudent? Surely, there is ſome occaſion, why you crye owt firſt, And then accuſe D. Harding, for ſpeaking ſo of Chriſt. And in deede in your Reply, ỹ Reader wil not perceaue but you mueighe moſt iuſtly, with, O what miſerable &c. For the wordes, which immediatly goe before writen in a diſtinct letter, as if they were al D. Hardinges, are theſe: *But Chriſt ſtraight waie vaniſhed from their ſight, vpon the breaking of the bread: And therefore had NO LEISVRE to deliuer the other portion: neither is there any mention made of the Cup.* Falſifier

Theſe you attribute to D. Harding, but that which you put in the middle of, *Chriſtes Lacke of LEISVRE,*

is not at al in D. Harding. Why cry you then vpon the miserable streictes that we are dryuen into, whereas ourselues made them not? Or what a miserable Juggler are you, to number it as in D. Hardinges owne text, ỹ *Christ lackt leisure*, which at al is not there: And afterwardes to Crie owt against hym, for saieng that, which is of your owne putting in only, & not of his?

The 11. Example. Jew. 134 Scoffer.

The sicke mans mouth was drye: Ergo he could not receiue the Cuppe. Who would make such reasons but M. Harding?

But M. Har. maketh thē not: Ergo, who would be so blinde or wilful, in conceiuing an other mans reason, but M. Jew? For D. Harding gathereth his Argument thus:

Har.

Bassus the Archeprieste, washed the mouth of Simeō lyinge sicke & feble, before he gaue hym the diuine Sacrament, And, such procuring of moisture had ben needlesse, if Simeon should haue receiued the holy Cuppe: Ergo he receiued vnder one kind only. Where finde you here M. Jew. ỹ he could not drinke, because he was drie? It appereth ỹ your selfe at this place had takē of some Cup to much, which could either

either mocke in an ernest matter so drilie, or vnderstād a reasonable argumēt so drōkēly.

I cā not see what necessitie is in this reason. The man is frentike, Or lieth Speechlesse: Ergo he cā not receiue the Sacrament bread. Iew. 140 The 12. Example.

In deede your eies herein serue you well. and euery reasonable man will beare you witnesse, that no necessitie, is in this Argument. But what necessitie was there, why you should not rightly, either perceaue Or repoꝛt D. Hardings reason? Foꝛ thus it is: The Sacrament was powred into the mouth of him, which in his sicknes demaunded hys housel, And er he dyed, fel into phrenesie, or became speachlesse: Ergo it was geauen, vnder onekynde and in forme of wine. Foꝛ how thinke you, M. Iewel, haue you seen oꝛ reade, that when men haue ben extreme sicke, Breade hath ben powred into their mouthes: by reason thē, it was wine which is sayed to haue ben powred. Consider also what foloweth in D. Harding, owt of the Councel of Toledo: where you shall fynde it proued, that Some sicke men are so vnable, to take the Sacrament in foꝛme of bread, ẏ they receiued ōly A draught of our Lordes Cup. Therefoꝛe, you are much deceaued, which thinke D. Har. to be as mad Har.

as you, and of phrenesie or lack of Speeche to gather, that they receiued in Forme of breade.

Iew. 147 The 13. Example. Wickedly.

If the Manichees would not beleue Leo or Augustine, that Christ had one body, how muche lesse would they beleue M. Harding, that Christ hath two bodies, the one in the Bread, the other in the cup, And eche wholy in the other?

where saieth D. Harding so? In no place at all, you maie be assured. but this is that which you carpe at, M. Iewel. The Catholikes beleue, and D. Harding for his parte confesseth, that vnder *either kynd,*

Har. Fol. 50. *Whole Christ is verely present.*

Christ therefore is not diuided, by one, or two, or moe, as your blasphemous Inuention dare make, but, the selfesame Christ, is by diuers and sundrie waies dispensed. For in A naturall and lesser Example: Your Anima, Life, or Sowle, is but one: the same is whole in your litle finger, whole in your thumbe, and in euery part of your body, Whole. Yet, you haue not (I trow) so many lyues by tale, as you haue toes and fingers. Now, if your brethern, or other vnlerned, wil not perceaue this

this true Principle, that, *Anima est tota in toto, & tota in qualibet parte*, which yet your self, I trust, doe admitt, how litle can they comprehend of Christes whole presence, vnder either kynde of the Sacrament? And how desperate are you, to make some beleue, that D. Hardinges opinion is, that one body of Christ, is in the Breade, An other in the Cup: whereas you can not be ignorant, of the Catholike and Receiued Faithe herein.

M. Hardinge, seemeth to reason thus: Ephrē made homilies in the Syrian tongue: And S. Hierome translated the Bible into the Slauō Tongue: Ergo, the Common Seruice, was in the Latine or Greeke tongue. The 14. Example. Iew. 158 Fanlie.

Many thinges seeme vnto you M. Iew. which are not so in deede. For D. Harding in these places which you allege, susteineth the person, not of an Opponent (as to you it seemeth) which maketh argument for his owne syde, But of a Respondent (As his boke declareth) which putteth awaie the obiections of his aduersarie. As in Exāple: *The homilies which Ephrem made in the Syrian Tongue, and the scripture* Harr. Fol. 74. 375.

which

which S. Hierome tranſlated into the Slauon tongue, were not part of the Publike ſeruice, nor ſerued to that purpoſe: Ergo, It is to no purpoſe to proue by them, that the Publik ſeruice was in the mother tongue.

To this effect D. Har. anſwereth: And doth not at all gather by holy Ephrem or S. Hierom, that the Seruice was in the Latine or Greeke tongue. There is a proper Place to doe euery thing in, And the Opponent and Reſpondentes partes, are diſtinct one from the other.

The 15. Example. Iew. 158

Here M. Hardinge taketh in hande, to Anſwer the Authorities by me alleged, And that with this ſpecial note of Remembrance in ye margin, M. IVELS ALLEGATION SOLVTED. It appeereth his Solutions be very ſhort. For what ſo euer be alleged, it is ſufficient for him, to ſaie, WHAT THEN? For wheras I ſaied &c. Al this is ſone Anſwered. For M. Har. ſaith, WHAT THEN? I alleged the ſaieing of S. Baſile, That the ſounde &c. The ſaieing of S. Hierome, THat ye noiſe &c. Lykewiſe of Chryſoſtom, COmmon petitions &c. But WHAT THEN? ſaith

what a doe vpon no Occaſion ſauyng yᵉ. Iew. of mine creatur.

saith M. Harding. why WHAT THEN? Thinketh M. Harding, that the Authoritie of Arnobius, S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Basile, S. Hierome, S. Chrysostome and other holy fathers is so light, that he is able to blow thē all awaye, with these two vaine syllables, WHAT THEN?

Here lacketh no Inuention, here lacketh no Amplificatiō, but only a Iust cause to bestow them vpon. For in deede, D. Harding saieth vnto M. Iewel (rowling in his Authorities) WHAT THEN? but he addeth further, *No man denieth you this.* How then, M. Iewel? Doth D. Har. thinke, the authoritie of holy Fathers to be light? Or, that he is able to blowe them all awaie, wt two vayne syllables? No verely his Spirite is not so mightie. But he directeth his (WHAT THEN) only to you, no *Father* yet, nor *Holy one*, askyng, to WHAT END you be so ernest, in that which no man denieth you? Because he reuerenceth the holy Fathers, therefore doth he admit their Authorities: but because it greeueth hym to see them brought furth, for a shew only and countenaunce to be made on your syde, without any iust occasion

occasion or purpose: therfore he demaundeth of you, by a WHAT THEN, to shew the cause wherfore you alleged thē. You draw a faire length M. Iewel, but you shoote at a wronge marke, Or at none rather at all.

The 16. Example. Iew. 199 Needeles Feare.

But he saieth, The place of S. Paule, is doubtful &c. S. Ambrose, S. Augustine, S. Chrysos. &c. vnderstode it diuersly. And wil he therfore conclude thus: These Fathers mistook S. Paules Sense, Ergo S Paule had no sense? Or, diuers Doctours, touching this place, had diuerse Iudgements: Ergo, we must haue no Iudgement.

Trouble not yourselfe M. Iewel, with any of these doubtes. for he geaueth you no occasion. But in answering your argumēt, and not in forming any of his owne, he requireth of you, that, S. Paules sense, where he speaketh of the blessing, and speaking w Spirit, being so doubtfull as it is, you should not so precisely conclude that he meaneth by Praying in Spirit, ỹ praying *with a noise of strange wordes, after your strange Interpretation:* Or crake before the people, that S. Paules wordes, are most manifest, that al publike Seruice,

1. Cor. 14

Par. Fol. 91

should

ſhould be in the Vulgare Tongue.

Now let vs conſider M. Hardinges reaſons.

The ſtate, ſaieth he, of the primitiue Churche was farr vnlike the ſtate of the Church we be now in: Ergo we are not bound to S. Paules Commaundementes. The 17. Example. Iew. 104. Slaunderouſly.

For ſhame of your ſelfe, why make you D. Harding to ſpeake ſo Contemptuouſly of the Apoſtle, and ſo proudly of him ſelfe? His mynd rather is, that, It is no Commaundement at al of the Apoſtle, becauſe there were neceſſarye occaſions, to geaue it in the primitiue Church, which are not ſo neceſſary now: And ſo it ceaſeth to be a Cõmaundement vnto vs. As, that women ſhould goe couered, it was his expreſſe Cõmaundement, yet now, I truſt, you make noe cõſcience of it, to ſuffer your Siſters to goe vncouered. Not becauſe you Reaſon thus: we are not bounde to the Apoſtles commaundement, but, becauſe the ſtate of this tyme, and that, beinge diuers, you would interpzete, that it continueth no moze to be a Commaundement. Har. 95. 1. Cor. 11

Againe he ſaieth: Some one or other in a pariſhe vnderſtandeth ſomwhat of the Latine tongue: Ergo they owght to haue the Seruice in a ſtrange Tongue. Not ſo M. Iewel, but: *Ergo the latine tongue* The 18. Example. Iew. 104 Har. Fol. 95.

is not vtterly Strange and vnknowen, And therefore not forbidden by S. Paule.

The 19. Example. Iew. 204 Absurdly. The People is sufficiently iustructed in Religiō: They come togeather now, not so much to be instructed, as to praie: ergo, *they ought* to haue the Seruice in a Strange tongue.

Neither is this so, M. Iewel, but *Ergo there is no necessitie, wherefore it should be in the vulgare.* As, for this Absolute conclusion, that it ought to be in Latine, how can any Catholike make it, whereas it is confessed, that the Pope hath dispensed with the Slauons to haue their Seruice in the vulgare Tongue, And may, if cause so require, permit it also vnto other Countries.

The 20. Example. Iew. 206 It were good (saieth M Harding) the people vnderstode the Seruice. Forgette not this good Reader, that the People vnderstode their Seruice M. Harding himselfe confesseth it were good. And why so?

Yea but remember, good Reader, or els marke D. Hardinges owne wordes, in which, he speaketh not absolutly of the people, but of people hauing humble and Reuerent hartes. And such to vnderstande their Seruice it were (he graunteth) good.

good. but see what foloweth in M. Iewel.

And why so? doubtlesse because he is forced to see and say, that it would redound to the Glorie of God, And to the greate Cumfort and Profite of the people. Therfore he saieth, it WERE GOOD. whereof we maie gather this argument, of the contrary: Then, that the people in this brute sort, is kept stil in ignorance, not vnderstandinge any portion of their Common Seruice, by M. Hardinges confession, It is il. And is it not lawful to doe that is Good, to Redresse that Is il, to seeke Gods glorie, And the cumfort of his People, without consent of a General Councel? &c.

Much making of nothing.

It were Good M. Iewel, euery man to know, The Rules of Physik, (to haue thereby how to helpe hymself) The Statutes of the Common Law, (the better to keepe them,) The Counsel of God in working owr Redemptiõ: And may you then, wel gather this Argument of the contrarie, that it is il to be ignorant of Phisike, Law, & Diuinitie? Surely, least you should take this aduantage, And shew after a wise sorte your folly, D. Harding prouided very well, but that you diuide his sentẽce, which is but one. For, after he had saied:

Shamefull Craft or Errour.

It

Har. *It were good the people hauing humble & reuerēt hartes vnderstode ỹ seruice:*
I denie not: Although you make, not only a ful point there, but also an ende of your 31. diuision, as who should thinke, D. Har. had saied as much as he wil in this sentēce: Yet there foloweth immediatly this aduersatiue, *yet al, standeth not in vnderstandinge.* By which he meaneth expresly, that though it were Good, the people to *vnderstand their seruice, yet it is not il, to be vnskilful thereof, because al standeth not in vnderstandinge,* as he proueth owt of two places of S. Augustine.

Now (see your fidelitie M. Iewel) this Aduersatiue YET, which openeth the matter, And should goe together with ỹ former parte of the sentence, you cut awaie cleane from it, And begyn your 32. diuision with it: that you might seeme not to haue Reasoned al in vaine, in saieing: This is good, ergo the other is il. Whereas if you take D. Har. whole meaning, you shal finde him to say no more in Effect, but, *This is good: yet ỹ*

other

other is not to be misliked. Haue you any Priuilege thus to peruert right Senses at your pleasure?

Owt of Origine M. Harding gathereth this Reason: The Angels are delited to heare vs reade or Praie although we of our weaknes know not throughly what we speake: Ergo the people in Origens tyme had the Common Seruice in a strange tongue. Not so M. Iewel, although the Conclusion be true. but if you add further to the Antecedent as you should doe, that the Reading of Psalmes though not vnderstanded, do prouoke the Angels to help vs, then foloweth the right consequent in deede, *Ergo there cometh profite to the Reader and hearer of the seruice in the Latine tongue, though it be not vnderstanded.* The 21. Example. Iew. 210 Har. 97.

The people, saieth M. Harding, is grosse and simple, And can not vnderstand the scriptures, by hearing the same in the Mother tongue: Ergo, they must heare it pronounced in the Latine tongue. This semeth to be a very simple Argument. The 22. Example. Iew. 214

It is so in deede, yet it is of your owne making which mysslike it. For D. Har. conclu-

concludeth after an other sort, saieing:

Had. Fol. 98. *Ergo, if our new masters wil condemne the Latine seruice in the Latine Churche, for that the people vnderstand it not, thei must also condemne, for a great part, ỹ Englishe seruice,* which, the common people, for ỹ greatest parte of the Scriptures read therein, doe not vnderstand.

The 23. Example. Jew. 216 Falsely. Seruice in the vulgare Tongue, is cause of Schismes and errours: Ergo, within 6. hundred yeares aftes Christ, it was ministred in some place, in a tongue vnknowen vnto the people. The force of this conclusion is euident. A very child may sone see through it.

Much more then, you see through it your selfe. And doe ye not then perceaue, ỹ it is of your owne subtile making, and none of D. Hardinges, whose Reason is this:

Har. 99. *The people of those countries, where the seruice was in the vulgare tongue haue continued in schismes and Errours: Ergo, example is not to be taken of them, for the seruice in the vulgare*

vulgare Tongue.

Of S. Ambroses wordes, M. Harding reasoneth thus: Peter, was the Chiefe of the Apostles, Ergo, the Pope is Head of the vniuersal Church. This Argument would be better considered, for as it is, it holdeth but weakly. The 24. Example. Iew. 146

Verely this is a weake Solution. But let the Argument be better considered, & formed in those termes which D. Harding vseth.

S. Androw followed our Sauior before ỳ S. Peter did, And yet Androw receiued not the Primacie, but Peter: ergo, the Apostolike see & Church of Rome hath the Primacie. Amb. 2. Co. 12. Har. 106.

Consider you now what Answer you may deuise. For this Argument doth not meddle, with the question of the Apostles Preeminence emong themselues, vnto which only you bringe it: but of Primacie in ỳ Church of Christ, ouer which though other Apostles were generall officers, yet the supremacie was singularly in S. Peter.

Paule went vp to Hierusalem to visite Peter The 25. Example. Iew. 153.

ter Ergo, the Bishope of Rome, is Head of
Folishely. the Church.

Is it not tyme, M. Jewel, either that some Physitian, or God hymselfe visite you, either to purge you of that euil humor which occupieth your heade: Or to take vengeance of you, which do so abuse your Readers in matters of so Great weight? D. Harding hymselfe maketh no other Argument in this place, but of Authoritie. and the reason which he bringeth, and you peruert is Theodoritus an Auncient Bishopes: who writing to Pope
Har. 108. Leo saieth thus: *If Paule, the preacher of truth and trumpet of the Holy Ghost ranne to Peter to bring from hym A determination And declaration, for them who at Antioche were in Argument and contention, concerning lyuing after Moyses Law: much more we, which are but smal & vile, shal runne to your Throne Apostolike, that of you we maie haue salue for the sores of the Churches.*

Doe

Doe you then, M. Iewel, cal this goeing for determination in a doubtfull question nothing els but S. Paules visiting of S. Peter? And would you haue it conceiued, either, that S. Peter was sicke there & il at ease, Or that for good willes sake and curtesie only, S. Paule went to visite hym? Byside this, D. Harding grou ded not his Conclusion vpon this argument, but that rather which foloweth in Theodoritus, which is this:

For in al thinges it is meete, that you haue the cheife doinges: Ergo it foloweth wel of Theodoritus authori tie, that the Pope is supreme.

The Church of Christ is one:
Ergo, the Pope is an vniuersal Bishope. The 16. Eyample. Iew. 255

That is an other question, which D. Harding went not about to proue by Natural Reason, but his present conclusion is this: *A multitude can not continue ONE, onlesse it be conteined and holden in, by ONE: But the Church continueth ONE, Ergo: it must* Har. 108.

haue ONE Heade or Gouernour.

Now, whether the Bishope of Sarum. or London, or Rome, or Constantinoph &c. shalbe that One Head, ouer al ỹ members of Christes mystical body in earth, that may be afterwardes consydered: but in ỹ meane tyme D. Har. goeth no further then Natural reason doth leade hym, that, *in A greate multitude and cumpanie, it is meete to haue One ouer the rest, if thei shal be kept in Vnitie.*

The 27. Example. Iew. 257 Unsensible.

Mankynd dependeth most of sense: Ergo the Pope is the Heade of the Vniuersal Church. Here is a very vnsensible Argument: nor sense nor reason can make it good.

Why make you it then? For D. Har. concludeth not so. But, whereas you in sayeing Christ only to be the Heade of the Churche, would inferre that the Pope is not anie Heade at al: in Answering this your obiection, he declareth that, *mankynd dependeth moste of sense, and receiueth al lerning and instruction of sensible thinges: Ergo* notwithstanding Christ be the cheife Heade, yet be-

Har. 108.

cause

cause he lyueth not visiblie emong vs, *the Church hath neede of a man to be her Gouernour, whom she maie perceiue by outward sense.* which man, whether he must be the Pope or no, he commeth not so low in this place. 109.

M.Hardinges reasons procede thus: God is careful and hath special Prouidence for his Church: Doubtful places of ỹ scriptures must be expoũded: General Councels must he summoned: Bishopes being at variance must he reconciled: Ergo, the Bishope of Rome is Christes General Vicar, and Head of the Vniuersal Churche. The 28. Example. Iew. fol. 260.

Ergo, (saieth D.Har.) by natural reason there must be *One Heade in ỹ Churche and one chiefe seruant in ỹ howsehold of Christ.* Mary ỹ ỹ Pope is he: ỹ is out of the cumpasse of natural Reason. which although it attaine vnto it, that by most perfite waie of Gouernemẽt, there should be One heade: Yet ỹ this or ỹ man should be he, by her owne power she cã not bring it to passe. & therefore, it was not directly so cõcluded of D.Har. in this place, as M. Iewel ful peruersly gathereth. Indirectly.

The 19. Example. Iew. 274. Fautlesse. 1 False. 2

This is a very poore helpe in deede. M. Harding here is faine to resemble the Bisshopes of Rome, touching their doctrine to Balaam, to Caiphas And to a Leaden Seale: And touching their lyues to confesse, thei are Lampes without light.

The first is false, through your reporting: the seconde is fautlesse, in D. Har. saieing. Concerning doctrine, he saieth: that the See of Rome hath this singular Grace, that he which sitteth in it, is compelled to teach truthe, like as Balaam and Caiphas were made to fulfill the blessed wil of God, notwithstanding their falsehode and wickednesse. The comparison therefore is not Ignominious to the Catholikes, but must Glorious to the praise of God, and most comfortable to the consciences of true Christians. And it consisteth, not as you report it (M. Jewel) spitefully enough, in resembling the doctrine of the Bishopes of Rome, to ỳ Persons of Balaam and Caiphas: but in resembling the Prouidence, Assistance, and Grace of God, in directing their doctrine vnto the like Spirite of Trueth and Prophecie, as God hymselfe vttered by Balaã and Caiphas, withowt their good wills.

Sophistrie.

In

In resembling also the doctrine of the B. of Rome, not vnto the matter of a leadden Seale, but vnto the Forme of a Seale, which is as true in the baleſt metal, as in the pureſt. And ſo let the Biſhop of Rome be as he wil, his doeinges ſhal not let the working of God: but as perfite a printe of his Truth, ſhal be made with a Leaden Seale, as a Golden.

Concerning now the other pointe, of lampes withowt light, he maketh not a General Rule, nor ſaieth that ỹ Biſhopes of Rome are ſo, (which worde you M. Iewel doe vſe) but, ſometyme (ſaieth he) *the ſee hath failed in Charitie, and it hath ben in caſe as it might truly ſaie: Our lampes be without light.* And this may be ſaied, either charitablie enough, naming no perſons, and ſorowing ỹ caſe: either very diſcreetly againſt Heretikes, which ſo obiect vnto vs the euil liues of Popes, as though it were an Article of our faith, that a Pope can neuer ſynne: or our cauſe were vtterly deſtroied, if ſo much were confeſſed or graunted. Which is ſo far otherwiſe, that it proueth rather

the

the prouidence & mercie of God towardes his Church to be exceding sure & greate in assisting the See of Rome, *in which euil men are constrained to tel Truthe, ẏ ẏ hope of ẏ faithful might be stedfast in God*, and not come & goe at the good or euil life of any Pope.

August. epi. 166.

These Examples (I trust) are sufficient and plaine enough of themselues, not only to proue, that M. Iewel hath very disorderly behaued hymselfe, in repeting of D. Hardings Argumentes, but also to warne euery Indifferent & Gentle reader of the Daunger which needes must folow, if without further serche or Consideration of the mater he take that for a Trueth and Certaintie, which M. Iewel once committeth vnto printing.

Note also, that al these forsayed Argumentes which M. Iewel hath thrust out of their right waie, to find fault with thē: contynue yet stil in their true sense and meaning, without any iust Replie or Answer to the contrarie. And so must those pointes of the Controuersies, betwene hym and vs, remaine as wel proued on the Catholykes syde, which are touched specially

specially in these forsaied argumentes and Examples, vnto which he hath geauen no direct or cleare Answer.

How M. Iewel disgraceth D. Har. Authorities.

CAP. V.

IT foloweth now shortly to declare, how M. Iewel Disgraceth and extenuateth, the Authorities of D. Har. For emong Sophistes, it is one of the kindes of Answering, when they can not directly or sufficiētly put away the argument: to deface then, by A croked worde, and a wrie mouth, Or a Lippe (as it were) the whole matter. which, the more vngracious it is, the deeper it is printed in the myndes of to many: And the viler it is, the more it needeth to be discouered, that ernest and sad Truthe, may not be so easely outfaced.

Surely if in temporall maters, where the thinges that men striue vpon are sensible, this maner of dealing (of which Examples shall folow out of M. Iewell) be

be vsed, the Stomakes doe so increase, ỹ it maketh men quickly to let goe wordes, and to come to blowes. Yet God forbid, that I should wisshe for any such Conclusion: but this doe I meane only, that if so greate offense be taken of a Temporall Iniurie: much more it should greeue vs to see maters of Religion depraued. And truely in Temporall causes, men oftimes are to quicke, but concerning the State of right faith and vnderstanding, they neede not mistrust least they be to deuout and diligent. Let the Examples declare, whether I burden M. Iewel rightly, or no.

D. Bar. after other causes which moued him, not to discredite ỹ Treatise of Amphilochius vpõ S. Basiles life & miracles, he sayeth at the last, *that this Treatise, is to be sẽe in the Librarie of S. Nasarius, in the Citie of Verona in Italie, Written in Veleme, for three hũdred yeres past, bearing the name of Amphilochius Bishope of Iconium.* But, A Calues skinne (quod M. Iewel) is no sufficient warrant of trueth.

Tom. 26. Baron. Ann. [illegible].

In

Indeede who can deny it? Neither doth D. Harding Conclude that it is to be credited, because it was writen in velome: but because it was writen so long agoe, and kept to this day in a Libzaric at Uerona.

D. Harding putteth a case of foure or fyue, which in time of sickneſſe should be desirous to Receiue: And, if neither the Preist be able, neither other be willing to Communicate with them, may not (saieth he) they Receiue seuerally? And doe not they Communicate together? See now, M. Iewells demeanure. Another Example.

Alas (saieth he) must he leaue al the old Doctours and holy Fathers, and begg at deathes dore, to geat sumwhat to help his Masse?

Alas M. Iewel, are you so vnsensible, that you thinke it to be a leaning of all Old Doctours, to make an Argument of A Sicke mans case? And, as you haue allreadie made a Rule, that no Authoritie against you shall stand, but that which is taken, iust out of the next six hundzed after Christ: will you so now perchaunce contemne all Reasons as beggarly, which are not without a certaine precincte of Iewel. 31. Reynd hart.

Deathes

Deathes Doze: I permit it to your Conscience, whether this your (Alas) became your State, Oz can be suffered in an ernest Question.

A Third Example.

An other Example. Here first I would aske the Indifferent Reader, whether an English man borne might not vse in his writinges the Authoritie of S. Basile: And whether, S. Basile reporting it, ẏ they which lyued in wildernesse, Oz in Alexandria, Oz in Egypt, had the Communion at home, And kept it with thẽ selues, And Receyued it of them selues: it were not lawfull to speake it againe, and to vse that Testimonie: Yet M. Iewell sayeth:

Iew. 138.

what a Hanger:

Verely, if M. Harding could finde any thing in the Church, he would not thus hunt the Mountaines: neither would he flee for ayde into AEgypt, if he could finde any neere at home.

what would this felow call the Liuing it self of holy men in Mountaines, which nicknameth the diligent gathering of Argumentes out of their lyuing a hunting of Mountaines: And calleth the vsing of the Fathers of Egypts Authoritie, a fleeing for ayde into AEgypt: How far I pray you,

you, will you ſuffer vs to goe for an Argument, without Obiecting of fleeing, vnto vs? Yet what aſke I you Leaue Or Counſel in this mater, which am ſure, ỳ Truth is not founde only in Europe: but in euery place of the world, where Chriſt is confeſſed.

Againe, who goeth farther? He that goeth in his Anſwer beyonde Reaſon, Or he ỳ Reaſoneth vpon a fact done beyonde the See called Mediterraneum, And applieth it to his purpoſe? Keepe your ſelf warme at home M. Iewell, as long as you may: for if you be once out of your owne Countrie, your Religion is ſo Vniuerſall and Catholike, that many myles before ye come to the Mountaines of Egypt, you will be taken for a Renegate.

The fourth Example. Iew. 142 Diſdainefully.

He hath alleged (ſaieth M. Iewell of Doctor Harding) two women, three ſicke folk in their death beddes: Perſonnes excōmunicate, Infantes, Phrenetikes, and Madd men: He hath alleged Napkyns, Cheſtes, Chambers, Mountaines and wilderneſſe.

He alleged theſe in deede, to proue Sole Receiuing. And if your Maſterſhip contemne the perſons, becauſe they were

VVomen,

VVomen, Sicke folke, Infantes, Phrenetikes: Or the thinges themselues, because in telling of thē, mention is made, of *Napkins, Chestes, Chambers and Mountaines:* yet let the Indifferent Reader consider, that these base Persons and Thinges were not, by or for thēselues respected of D. Harding: but the Authoritie of Tertullia, Eusebius, S. Cyprian, S. Basile, S. Ambrose, and other (out of whome these Examples of women, Infantes, Mad men, Napkins and Chestes, were taken) was only regarded and followed.

By such Eloquēce as M. Jewel vseth, the professed enemies of Christs Gospel, might furnisshe their wickednesse.

Saincte Matthew (all faithfull beleue) did write a True Gospell, the Authoritie thereof is moste vndoubted and holy. would M. Jewell then thinke it sincerely done to scoff out the matter, And to depraue the whole, by telling vs, that all the discourse or the most that he maketh, is of, *Lazares, Boyes, Old womens Agues, Sicke folkes, Blinde beggars, Dūme persons, Mad men, Lunatikes, Old Nettes,*

Matth. 8. 9. 12.

Nettes, Barley Loaues, two Fisshes, and Greate Store of Hey.

S. Augustine testifieth of the Peoples affection in his tyme, that for Reuerence towardes the Sacrament, they were carefull to haue a cleane Lynen Clothe to carie it therein home with them, And receaue it, when they were disposed. S. Cyprian witnesseth, that the Sacrament was kepte in a womans chest, & that when she being vnworthy, would haue opened and Receiued it: fire came furth and fraied her away. And in this sorte could I reherse other authorities, to proue, that Sole Receauinge was not only vsed, but Reuerently also vsed, in the Primitiue Church. And will M. Iewel so Extenuate these matters, as though it were no more worth then a chest, or a Napkin, that which is alleaged of the reporte of S. Augustine, and S. Cyprian?

Hard. fo. 54.

If it lothed those Holy and Reuerend Fathers to speake of Chestes & Napkyns, when the narration and historie so Required: may it freely be skorned at, to reherse ẏ selfsame fact after them againe, and to make mention of Chestes and Napkyns? But here also, let any Indifferent man be Iudge, whether it standeth with the Gra-

nitie of an high Minister, so cõtemptuously to speake of the Testimonies of Auncient Fathers.

The fyfth Example. Hard. fol. 42.43.

D. Harding alleageth the Councels of Agatha, of Aucrna, and Constantinople, which make mention of priuate Oratories & Chapels to say Masse in. Herevpon saith M. Iewel:

Iew. 73. Much in his pastim

In his former allegation, he sought his Masse in litle Townes and Villages: now he hunteth for it, in priuate mens houses.

was the last Supper of Christe, or his Institutinge there of the Sacrament, and Sacrifice of the new Lawe, any pointe the worse, because it was but an obscure Parlor, where he wrought those Mysteries? And call you this A Huntinge for a Masse in Priuate houses, to Reason out of the open decree of three Auncient Councels? If you would vse lesse barking and byting, then to hunt after Auncient Recordes, we would not mislike it in you.

D. Hardinge proueth out of Leontius a Bisshope in Cypres, that:

The sixth Example. Hard. fol. 43.

Iohn the holy Patriarche of Alexandria, sayed Masse, and Receaued alone.

M. Ie-

M. Iewel inferreth:

A ſtraite caſe for M. Hardinge to runne to Alexandria, A thouſande miles beyonde al Chriſtendome, to ſeeke his Maſſe, and that not in Open Church neither, but in Priuate Oratories.

Why is it a ſtraite caſe? May not a Lerned man as ſone come from Englande to Alexandria, as he may turne from one boke to an other, and thinke nowe of one thing, then of an other? Alexandria is not ſo farre in miles beyonde al Chriſtendome, as you be far in your degrees beyonde all Grauitie. For if the Authoritie of Leontius doth not weighe with you, it is A plaine anſwer to refuſe it: but to obiecte the bringing of an Argument out of an Hiſtorie reported for done in Alexandria, and to Terme it A Runninge beyonde all Chriſtendome, it may be founde in children which in their Declamations are permitted to vſe what ſo euer Figure they can, Or in the Vices parte vppon the Scaffolde, Or in Jeſters mouthes at the tables of Secular men: but in their Writinges, which would ſeeme to folow the Spirite of Chriſt, and Zeale of Trueth, it can not be ſuffered. Iew. 78. Childiſhly.

The seuenth Example.

S. Basile (Amphilochius writeth) was thought of Christe to celebrate Masse, in whiche he diuided the Sacramente into three partes, and Receaning one by hym selfe alone, the other two he Reserued. And so by this Testimonie, Priuate Masse is sufficiently proued. Or, if it proue nothing to hym whiche refuseth the Authoritie of Amphilochius by whome it is writen, yet to him which would take it for a true historye, no doubt but it serueth for Priuate Masse. M. Iewell then supposing it to be true, let vs see how he trauaileth to disgrace it. His wordes are these:

Iew. 86. But if all this (that Amphilochius reporteth of S. Basils Saieing of Masse) were good record, and mater of trueth: yet &c cæt.

What intend you by this Yet? would ye not beleue it? would ye not embrace it? would ye not be ruled by it? would ye not yeld and Subscribe? Considering that Amphilochius liued wtin ỹ six hundred after Christ? No surely, you would not. For you haue so many wayes to depraue thinges, ỹ you may graunt our asking vnto vs, and kepe your selfe still to the winninge syde. Which how cunningly you do in this place I will take the paynes to consider.

I fall

If al this were good record &c. Yet were it but a Miracle.

Do ye make a But at a Miracle? And such a Miracle, as standeth with a Truth? I looked, that you would haue diminished somewhat of the price of the Good Record of which you spake, and to that end your YE Fathers did lead vs: but you haue so forgoten your selfe, that you make it the stronger, by that very thing, which you brought to weaken it by. For a Record may be true and good, and yet it foloweth not the fact to be alowed: but if a Miracle be wrought about it, it is not only to be compted as True, because of the thing it self & witnesse of Man, but also to be alowed as Good, because of the testimonie of God geauen to it by Miracle. It foloweth in M. Iewel:

Marke to the end of this place the exquisite exceptions against the witnesse.

But a Vision.

As who should say, that an Historie were the worse, because it consisteth of a Vision from God, and not of the externall sight and Record of man. what wise man would euer say: Let it be true, that Iacob saw Angels goeing and cumming vp and doune vpon the ladder betweene Heauen & earth, yet were it but a Vision. Is this your sight in Diuinitie, to diminish a Trueth by the

manner of Repreſenting it. It may be proued that to ſee thinges in a Viſion, whi the mind is eleuated from bodyly ſenſes, is perfiter in degree of dignitie, then to ſee them with corporall eyes, where more meanes and more groſſe are occupied. Yet (ſayeth M. Iewel, contemptuouſly) it were but a Viſion. It foloweth in hym:

And perhaps a Dreame.

Wiſely ſayed, I promiſe you, and agreably to your former wordes. For how can theſe two Propoſitions ſtande together? If it were a matter of truth, yet perhaps but a Dreame. Doe not theſe, the one playnly hynder the other? Or can ye graunt ẏ one, and feare the other? May, if it were of good Recorde and mater of trueth, then vndoutedly it was no Dreame. But you, of a great confidence and courage doe permit vs the firſt, And yet of a miſerable forgetfulneſſe or fearfulneſſe, are not reſolued in ẏ ſecond. In ſayeing: If all were good Record: you permit vs to take it, and your ſelfe, by puttinge the caſe, doe graunte it: In addinge, Yet were it perhaps but a Dreame, you take awaye from vs that whiche you graunted, and your owne ſelfe are contraried by your ſelfe. For (to ſaye it againe)

if is

if it were mater of truth, it was no dreame: and if perhaps it were A Dreame, you should not then haue bene so absolute or bountifull, as to let vs receaue it for a mater of Trueth. It foloweth:

But one mans fact.

You asked but for any one sufficient example, when you challenged vs. The fault therfore can not be in that it is One, but if you dare answer that S. Basils fact alowed by Christ himselfe, is not sufficient, then say you somewhat. It foloweth.

But once done.

Once done is truly done, and so much is inough against thē which deny ẏ it was at any time done. Againe, Once done in the presence of Christe, and by hys apointement, is for euer done, to confirme the faith of the Catholikes. It foloweth:

Not in the day tyme, but at midnight.

What thinke you then M. Jewell, that there is no Trueth, when the Sunne is downe? Or that euil Spirites only doe occupie the worlde at midnight? Or that God is A God of the daye, and not of the Nyghte? Is not this A worthie cause to set lesse by S. Basiles Masse, for that, whē other were asleepe, he waked

And that Christe made him not tarie till vnde daye, but straite wayes to rise and Say Masse at midnight: What fault you find with midnight I can not tel: but your Literall sense in this place beinge so foolishe, either you haue some pure and fine Mysticall sense, Or els you take so litle rest in the night, that in the day time your wittes be not your owne. It foloweth:

And that without cumpanie, and without Witnesse.

Concerning the companie, Christ and his Angels were present: concerning the witnesses, take awaye Eubulus which saw it, yet as many were present, as were at the Annuntiation of our Ladie, Or the Resurrection of Christ our Saniour. at whiche though no man was present, yet by the euent of thinges, and credite of thē which haue reported it, it is as true as an Article of our faith. Againe, what neede witnesses, your selfe permitting the Recorde of Amphilochius to be good, and the mater true: How hangeth this together M. Iewell: If all were true, yet was it done without witnesse For what would you say I pray you: meane you this, that if it were true, yet it was false: Or, if the Recorde were good, yet is it

is it not to be credited? For to what other purpose ye complaine of lacke of witnesse, I can not tell, but for that you iudge the Recorde without it, not to be good. Otherwise if you will not plucke backe your Liberalitie, nor take awaye that which you haue graunted, but let it stand that the Record is good, why disgrace you it by saying, yet it was without witnesse? And so by consequence, no good Recorde. Thus in this Testimonie also, it appeareth, what wisedome and Arte M. Iewel hath in defacing of Authorities: and that after, him selfe (all circumstancies considered) hath permitted them to stand for true and good.

The viij. Example.

D. Harding, out of S. Bede, doth make reporte of one Iames a Deacon of Yorke, a very cunning man in songe: and of Tednom a Diuine maker of Dities, whome M. Iewell calleth Tednome (For so his name is reade in Beda writen in parchement saieth he, forgetting him selfe that a sheepeskynne can be no more sufficient warrant of trueth, then a calfeskinne) but (be it Tednom or Tednam) what saieth he to hym, Or to Iames the Deacon?

Hard. fol. 88 90.

I litle thought, M. Harding would so much haue bewrayed his want, to proue his mater by Pipers and Poetes.

189. Blinde Harper.

Make

Make you no more accompt, of Musicians and Versifiers? Many a Minstrel is in your Ministerie, and many A Twanger vpon his harp A: & whome venerable Bede commendeth to the posteritie with singular praises, are they but Pypers and Poetes with you? Asaph, Heman and Idithū, because they made, and songe prayses vnto God, might a sober Panyme call them Pipers and Poetes? Iuuencus, Sedulius, Prudentius, ought they to be of litle price or estimation, because they were makers of Verses? Cednom (sayeth Bede) made songes, conteyning mater of the holy Scripture, with such exceding sweetnesse, and with such a grace: that many feelinge theyr hartes compuncte and prickte, with hearinge and reading of them, withdrewe themselues from the loue of the worlde. Speake not therefore M. Iewell againste the Grace of God: And these sweete meanes, whiche he hath prouided, to allure men thereby to his Loue, terme them not Pypinge or Poetrye.

Perchaunce, if ye had some such pyper as Cednom was, to syng and play before you, when the Spyte troubleth you,

there

there might be hope, that you would be more quiete and reasonable. Hope, I say, there might be, but no assurance, because sometymes you are so taken, that I feare, if Kinge Dauid hym selfe should play before you, though you would not be so furious, as to caste your speare at hym: yet you would be so madly merely disposed, as to call him a Piper.

By these few Examples then, lette it be tried, whether M. Iewell hath folowed an honest fashion, in his Replieng. And whether it becummeth hym, which would be compted vpright in his Doctinges, so to play the Childes, the womans, the Madmans, the Phrenetykes, Or the Mynstrels parte, in Toyinge, in Iestinge, in Imagyninge, and in Harpinge so as he hath done, about D. Hardinges Testimonies. For what is there now lefte, which may not be (after M. Iewels Rhetorike) contemned?

If the Authoritie of suche as haue writen at any tyme these nyne hundred yeres be alleaged, it is (sayeth M. Iewel straitewayes) out of the cumpasse of the first six hundred yeres.

If

If we bringe the Example of such as lyued solitarilie within those six hundred yeres: Ye flee (sayth he) for ayde into Ægipt, or ye hunt the Mountaines.

If the Example of populouse Cities far distant from vs be alleaged, then ye goe (saieth he) A thowsand miles beyond Christendome.

If ye speake of their case, which are nigh their death, Alas (saieth he) ye begge at deathes dore.

If the Auncient Fathers, S. Cyprian, S. Basile, S. Ambrose, and others, be brought in, to confirme your purpose, you must take heede, that no mention in theyr testimonies be made of Boyes, women, Infantes, Phrenetikes, Cheastes, Chambers, wilderneſſe &c: For then al the whole shalbe disgraced, because of those base thinges and Persons.

Beside this, a confessed Trueth is not to be estemed, if it were either but once, Or without cumpanie, Or done at midnight.

To be shorte, no Musitian shalbe alowed, because he is a Piper, and no maker of verses, neuer so good, because he is a Poete. And so the conclusion will be, that nothing almoste shalbe brought so worthy

and

and euident: but M. Iewel, by his arte and policie, wil make it obscure and simple. If this be tolerable, thē is D. Harding answered: but if this be vnreasonable, then hath not M. Iewell vsed a necessarie point of discretion or modestie.

Of M. Iewels wrangling with D. Harding.

CAP. 6.

THis, whiche already I haue specified, is to muche for a sober man to vse: but this yet is not all that M. Iewel abuseth himselfe in, againste D. Harding. For byside peruerting or defacing of his Authorities, he wrangleth also, very contentiously with him. And that, not after a general sense only or meaninge of this worde, but after a Singular & proper fashion. For (to speake in general) Al the deprauing of D. Hardings Argumentes, al the disgracing of his witnesse, al the turning and shifting from one pointe and state of the question to an other, which (as I haue shewed) M. Iewel vseth in the first

faure

foure articles: all this (I say) may wel goe vnder the name of contention and quarelinge: and in this sense, the whole Replie, is stuffed therewithall. But, in this place, I note that singular kind of cõtẽtiousnes, by force of which, any man driueth his aduersary to prouing of that, which is either so possible, that a thousand experiencies declare it: either so credible, that they themselues which aske for proofe of it, do openly and plainly confesse, that they doe not deny it. As in three or fower Examples:

VVhat if foure or fiue (sayeth D. Harding) of sundrie houses in a sickenes tyme, being at the point of death, in one Parisshe, require to haue theyr rightes er they departe?

This case, is not only possible by course of time, but also common through infection of cõtagious aiers. But yet M. Iew. replieth.

What if no man happen to be sicke? Then hath M Harding loste a good Argument.

But what if some happen to be sicke? Then haue you (M. Iewell) found a Rude Obiection. For of the two, which is more possible? To haue in a plage tyme, foure or fyue

or fiue Sycke: Or to haue a tyme of Sycknes, and none at all Sycke in it? For, of a tyme of Sycknes, D. Hardinge dyd speake. And if you will put (A what if) againste the tyme it selfe, and suppose that there is no plage at all: as this I graunt is possible, so is, by lyke Reason, the other also. Neither can you by putting your case, so distroie the contrarie supposition, that you might seeme to make it frustrate and voide: Or disapointe thereby your Aduersaries purpose.

What if foure or fyue Principall Protestantes should be conuerted by Reading the Bookes of Catholykes: could not they vtter many secrete Deuises of yours, for Open professing of whiche you lacke but a better worlde?

Yea, but saie you againe, what if suche wayes be taken for lettinge af Catholyke Bookes to come into the Realme, that by Readinge of them, none shall see what is Answered? In deede, you haue put me a case, whiche is lykely inough, and I could sone Answer vnto it, that it is a hard Case also, to Pronoke, and Challenge, And bid men speak, & make as though we should haue cõmendation for our frenes. Iew. 31.

And

And at ỹ very beginning, to let thẽ ỹ would and should, or reade or heare what we say. But yet, what were this to ỹ answer of my question? For it is possible inough, that although you make the serche neuer so diligent, yet some wise men of your owne side wil be desirous to vnderstãd our answers, & not be hastie to condẽne vs before iudgemẽt. Therfore, whẽ a likely or possible case is put, to make a cleane cõtrary vnto it, as though it were thẽ fully refelled, what other thing is it, but to light vpon anger, & not for truth: And to procure troble only to ỹ aduersary, and not to manifest and open your owne doctrine.

Of what affectiõ & humor shal I say it cõmeth, ỹ you dare permit ỹ historie which Iew.91. Amphilochius writeth of S. Basile to be true, & yet wil not be ruled by it? Doth not this proue, ỹ you haue a spirite of cõtention within you, and that you shift to make exceptions against the Trueth?

Iew.89. That you mislike not daily preaching, & yet ỹ you reproued. Harding for saieing ỹ in Antioche ỹ scriptures were dayly expoũded & preached, doth it not argue a contẽtious stomake? for suppose ỹ it were not true, yet no harm cũming therof vnto ỹ reader,

what

what neede was there of a special and solemne reselling of it? No dout but if you were disposed (M. Iew.) you could quickly fynd it owt, that dayly exposition of the scripture might be in Antioche, and yet ỹ cõmon people be called thercunto but once a weeke, as S. Chrysostome saieth. For it might be throughowt the Churches of Antioche by course, and in that course, the sermon might be one daye in S. Chrysostomes church. Also there might be dayly expounding of the scriptures to ỹ Clergie though not to the people: And the Proposition conteyning in it nothing against good maners, or truth of doctrine, a quiet man in so much matter byside, requiring in deede a ful Answer, would not haue troubled hymselfe with this question.

when you saie in an other place, that, It is neither denied of you, nor any part of your quæstion, that sundrie nations in Asia the lesse vnderstoode not the Greeke, and yet notwithstandinge, is not M. Harding hable to proue it with al his Gheasses: doe ye not signifie by these wordes, that your good wil is not, plainely and peaceablie to declare the Trueth of your doctrine: but your Stomake is against ỹ person of Iew. 160.

your aduersarie, and that ye seeke to contrarie his saieinges?

When you saye: Verely if a man by waie of contention, would saie, the Licaonical tongue was a corruptiō or difference of the Greeke tongue, & not a seueral tongue of it
Iew.164 selfe, M. Har. should haue much a doe, to proue the contrarie: And in saieing so, whē yourselfe by, & by, doe contrarie D. Har. therein, is it not straitewaies manifest, ẏ you folow the waye of contention?

More might be brought against you, M. Iew. in this kinde: but if by these few Examples it be perceiued, that you haue wrangled and strined, where no cause was offered, I trust that although yourself be so affected, ẏ you wil neuer submit yourselfe, And yeld to the Catholike and Romane Church, yet other, which loue trueth and Sinceritie, wil take heede how they commit the settling of their myndes & consciencies, to the Positions and Answeres of a man so contentiouse. As on the other side if these so manifest Examples, proue not plainely what you are, it profiteth not to bring more copie, where store sufficient is not considered.

Of

Of the Buts which M. Iewel vseth with D. Harding.

CAP. VII.

THe marke, that M. Iewel shooteth at, is to Refel D. Hardings answer: which how many wayes he hath pricked and roued at, as also how artificially he hath bestowed his strength therein, I haue, by example, declared. And now I thinke it good to shew, what buts he vseth. Such buts of his I meane, which like an Hypocrite he would seeme to haue set vp of his own motion, where as in deede D. Harding had made them vnto him before, that he should not, al at pleasure, Roue or hobbe abrode at euery marke ỹ liked his fansie. As in Exãple D. Har. thought it good, (before he should speak of Sole receiuing or priuate Masse) shortly to alleage such authorities, by which ỹ Masse or Sacrifice of ỹ new testa-stament, was cõfirmed. Against which, M. Iew. speaketh his worst, & proueth three leaues together, ỹ either the witnesses be not lawful, either that they proue not Priuate Masse. Now the Trueth being this, ỹ D. Har. brought thẽ not in, to con-

firme Priuate Masse, M. Iewel therefore least he might seeme to haue taken his Marke amisse, so long togeather as three leaues are in his Replie, he commeth (as I saie) from Roning aboute the mater, to the very state thereof, saieinge:

The first Example. Iew. 12. wel shott.

BVT he wil saie, he alleged al these doctours to an other purpose, to proue the Sacrifice.

Wil he saie so M. Iewel? and hath he not rather saied it alreadie? Are not these his expresse wordes: that, although you in a printed Sermon, and preached at Poules Crosse, pretend enemitie against Priuate Masse in word, yet in deede, that you extēd your whole witt and cunning, vtterly to abolisshe the vnbloudy and dayly Sacrifice of the Churche? And hereupon, doth not he name shortly the Authorities, by which he might proue the vnbloudy Sacrifice? In the end of which maketh he not a transition saieing, Now this presupposed, that the Masse standeth vpon good and sufficient groundes, let vs come to our special purpose, & saie somewhat of Priuate Masse? What vanitie then was it of yours, (M. Iewel) to make so greate a talke against the witnesses alleged that they proue not Priuate Masse, for which yet they were

Har. 24.

not

not brought, and how like an Hypocritie come you in with your, But he wil saie he alleged al these Doctours to an other purpose, whereas D. Harding so plainely declared it, that in deede he vsed them not for profe of priuate Masse, but only of the dayly and vnbloudy Sacrifice.

The 1. Example.

After a like sort, concerning the nũber of Canons which were made in the first Nicene Councel, you aske this question, and to seeming, oppose your Aduersarie with it, saieing:

Iew. 239

What leadeth M. Harding to saie, The bishope of Rome hath these three score and ten Canons in safe keeping? Why doth he thus dissemble and mocke the world? Certainely the bishope of Rome himselfe disclameth it, and saith he hath them not. for thus he writeth touching the same: There are in the Church of Rome only twentie Canons of the Councel of Nice, By what negligence the rest are lost, it is not knowen. The Pope saieth there are but twentie Canons extant: M. Harding saieth, there are three score and ten Canons. I trow, it is no reason we should beleue M. Harding, and leaue the Pope.

It is no reason in deede. Yet if they speake not contrarie one to the other, then

is it no Reason, that you should in such sort handle the mater, as though thei were repugnant. For true it is, that as ỹ Pope saied, there are but twentie Canons extãt, yet ỹ there were once more then twentie, it appereth by these wordes which folow immediatly: By what negligence the rest are lost, it is not konwen. Also that there were in Tyme Past three score and ten Ca-
Har. 104. nons of the Councel of Nice, true it is, and so it is saied of D. Harding: but that there are at this Present Tyme so manie, he saieth it not, though you boldly report it of hym, to make A Contradiction, betweene hym and the Pope.

Now, maie we thinke, that you perceiued not this much by yourselfe? Yeas without al doubt you dyd. and therefore not ignorant that you had ouershott your selfe, and that the Catholike would bring you from your Roning, to certaine and set Markes, yourselfe come welfauoredly to them, and saie:

BVT Steuen the Bishope of Rome saieth: there were sometyme in Rome the ful three score and ten Canons.

O M. Iewel, doe you see, that this wil

eb

be your Answer? Or rather that so much is included in the wordes of Pope Stephanus, And yet dyd you bring his Testimonie in, to proue D. Hardings report false, which saied no more, then that the *Whole number, of these three score and ten Canons, was kept diligently in the Church of Rome?*

Tel vs now, who dissembleth? Or who mocketh the world? And therefore was not this BVT of yours first considered, before you dyd so sharply inueigh against D. Harding? For both the Pope and he, speakyng of the Tyme Past, it is true that three score and ten Canons of the Nicene Councel were in Rome: And the Pope speakyng of the tyme Present, that twentie only are extant is not contrarie to hym that speaketh of ỹ Tyme Past, saieng that, *three score and ten Canons were kept in Rome.*

And therefore it may be iustly returned vpon you againe M. Iewel, that, Non satis commodè diuisa sunt temporibus tibi Daue hæc. Iew. 237

The third Example.

Let vs bring an other Example. To proue the Soueraintie of the Churche of Rome, D. Bar. allegeth S. Iren. saieing: Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3, *Ad hanc ecclesiam propter maiorem principalitatem &c. To this Church (of Rome) it is necessarie all the Churches, that is to saye, al that be faithful anywhere, to repaire & come togeather, for the mightier Principalitie of the same.*

1 In answering to this testimonie: first, saieth M. Iewel, Irenæus speaketh not of

Rouing. the Supremacie. Then, saieth M. Iewel againe: Irenæus writeth only against Valen

2 tinus, Cerdon and Marcion old Heretikes, whom he biddeth for trial of their doctrine, to behold the Churches which the Apostles

3 planted. After this, he telleth vs ỳ Ireneus resteth specially vpon the Example of the Church of Rome, & by this rouing, he would haue it thought, that he hath not Answered nothing. And then it foloweth:

4 But they wil Replie, Irenæus saieth, pro-

Iew. 244 Hypocrite pter maiorem principalitatem.

Haue ye founde it now at length? and dyd ye not perceaue at the first alleging of Irene-

Ireneus, ẏ ẏ force of D. Hardinges Argument consisted in these wordes, propter maiorem principalitatem, becauſe of the greater principalitie of ẏ Church of Rome: why diſſimble you then? And why plaie you the hypocrite ſo artificially, in keping that backe, which ſhould haue ben at the very firſt Anſwered: And in delyuering it whē it cummeth, after ſuch a ſort, as maie cauſe the Reader to conceiue, that it is of your owne pure Inuention, and not of your aduerſaries obiection: And that you doe freely of your owne wil and wit encreaſe ẏ ſtrength of the witneſſes brought againſt you, and ſpeake more for your Aduerſarye, then he hath done for hymſelfe?

Thei wil (you ſaie) Replie. Wil thei? Maie thei doe: And not Replie, as though it would depend of a former argument, but Obiect, without anie preambles, that, *The Greater or mightier Principalitie of the Church of Rome, which Irenæus* ſpeaketh of, doth proue the Supremacie therof aboue al other Churches. Yet you But only, at it.

There is alſo a very plaine Teſtimonie of The fourth Example.

of S. Ambrose, alleged by D. Har. for the Supremacie of the see of Rome: And the strength of the argumēt consisteth in this
Amb. lib. 2. cap. 6. ỹ the Chiefstie of the Apostolike priesthood is affirmed by him to florish the there. Note ỹ wordes, Chiefstie, and priesthoode. For vntil answer be made to thē, al besides is but Rouing. As in Example owt of M. Jewel.

1 He admitteth first, S. Ambrose wordes, and addeth more vnto them, to the praise of the Church of Rome. He preferreth (and
Al by side ỹ marche. worthely) the Glorie of Christs Gospel before the power of the Romane Empire. He encreaseth the mater, by the testimonies of S. Augustine, and S. Chrysostome, and leaueth it as a most plaine and manifest Trueth, that Rome was more noble for the Gospel of Christ then the Empire of the world. And whereas he is not so dul, but perceaueth wel enough, that al this geare cummeth not to the point of ỹ argument, then he cummeth to his familiar B V T, saieing:

Jew. 248 But S. Ambrose saieth, *Apostolici sacerdotij principatum: The principalitie*

litie of the Apostolike Priesthoode.

Yea forsoth M. Iewel, of the Principalitie of Priesthoode, S. Ambrose speaketh. And we maye wel wonder, that al this while, you haue dissembled, as though you had not seene the marke which we set before you, to direct your answer therevnto. Now how wel you haue Replied concerning these two Testimonies. of S. Iren. and S. Ambrose, it shal be examined in the place proper for it, which wil be in the third Booke. At this present, I note your Craft only and Hypocrisie, by which you conueigh the matter so, that you maie first wander abrode, withowt scope in deede, yet not withowt some apparance of direct Answer, and that, afterwardes, you come with A B V T to the very poynt of the argument, and make it seeme that this B V T was set vp of your owne self, and not of the aduersarie.

Of which kynde, he that wil require moe examples, maie for the seking, easely haue thē. And when he findeth thē, let hym remember, that it is but a lewde kynde of Rhetorike, either so to daly with the Aduersarie,

uersarie, either so to delay the right Answer vnto the mater proponed. And now to an other point.

Of M. Iewels Refellyng one Truthe by an other.

CAP. VIII.

IT is A common thing with you (M. Iewel) in Answering, to put awaie one Trueth by an other: Or by adding one to an other, so to confoũde them bothe, that no certainety shalbe founde in the question. Which surely is a good prouision, ẏ you may haue sumwhat alwaies to Replie: but except there folow a better Application, it should not in any part satisfie. As in Example,

The first Example. Eccl. Histor. lib. 5. ca. 24.

when Ireneus witnesseth that Bishopes of the Greke Church cummyng to Rome, had the Eucharistia sent vnto them, to signifie their mutual Communion in Sacrament, notwithstanding their Diuersitie in keeping of Easter: though you should bring neuer so manye Examples, that

that, Paulinus sent at one tyme a loaf of breade to S. Augustine, at an other, fyue loues, and them in token of good will: yet doe ye not proue hereby, that the Eucharistia, which S. Ireneus speaketh of, was not, as the Catholikes expounde it, the Sacrament. For neither is the bread which S. Paulinus sẽt, called Eucharistia, neither doe such Presentes from one to other, proue a consent in Religion: And ỹ which S. Ireneus speaketh of is called Eucharistia, and the cause for which it was sent (which was to signifie their vnitie, in the Substance of our Religion) doth require that it should be ỹ Sacrament. And so I saie, true it is that Bishopes presented Bisshopes, with tokens of mutual frindship: but this Trueth must not destroie or confound an other Trueth, of the Custome in the Church of Rome, to send the very Sacrament to the Bishopes that came from the East Churche. And in this place (M. Jewel) you lacke not Inuentiõ, but Application: And you bring furth in deede faire loues, but you match them not rightly with the Sacrament. Iren. 40.

Eucharistie.

The sum of M. Jewels Answer is this: The loafe which Paulinus sent vnto S. Augustine

guſtine was not the Sacrament: Ergo, the Euchariſtia which S. Irenæus witneſſeth to haue ben ſent to bishopes of the Eaſt cummyng to Rome, was not the Sacrament.

The 2. Example.

Leontius a Greeke writer, repoꝛteth of the Patriarke of Alexandꝛia, ỹ he ſaied Maſſe (fecit Miſſas) in his Oꝛatoꝛie. yet wil it not neceſſarily folow (ſaieth M. Iew.) that Miſſa in this place, importeth the maſſe. For, as I haue already proued by ſundry Authorities, Miſſa is oftentymes vſed for any kynd of praier.

Iew. 78. Miſſa.

But what then? If it be oftentymes ſo vſed, muſt it not be otherwiſe vſed in this place of Leontius? How pꝛoue you this Conſequence? Oꝛ how Applie you ỹ one place to the other? Bꝛeifly then to repete it, M. Iewels anſwer is this:

Miſſa is often tymes taken for any kynd of Praier: Ergo the Maſſe, which holy Iohn the Almener ſaied, was not properly maſſe.

The 3. Example.

In the ſame hiſtoꝛie of Leontius, D. Harding expounded (cum benedixiſſet ſancta) **thus in Engliſhe:** when the Patriarch had conſecrated. **which pꝛoueth (by the waie) that** (miſſa) the Maſſe, **of which the Stoꝛie ſpeaketh, is not taken foꝛ any kind of Pꝛaier, becauſe,** bleſſing of the holy thinges or conſecratiõ is not vſed generally in euery kynde, but in Special mater, Tyme,

Benedicere ſancta.

and place. But to note, what M. Iewel concludeth, of Benedicere sancta:

These wordes doe no more signifie (saieth he) the cõsecration of the Sacrament, as M. Harding hath translated it, then these wordes, Extollite manus vestras in sancta, doe signifie the lifting vp of handes to the Sacrament. And why so? Chrysostome in his Lyturgie vseth the same manner of speach, to a far other purpose. what is ỹ? He allegeth the wordes, and then inferreth: It maie appeare, that Chrysostome by these wordes, meant a solemne praier to cõclude ỹ whole. Iew. 78.

But how applie you now these thinges to your purpose? because, S. Chrysost. meaneth by Benedicere Sancta, a praier to conclude his liturgie, doth Leontius vnderstãd, iust ỹ same by those wordes? In what Logik fynde you that Consequence? Or, by what maner of likelihoode, make you it probable? Mark it better (M. Iew.) & you shal perceaue, ỹ which you would cõclude not õly to be vnlikely, but also impossible. For, ỹ benediction of which S. Chrysost. speaketh, was you saie a solẽne Praier to cõclude ỹ whole: but ỹ Benedictiõ of which Leõtius telleth you, was before the Pater noster, of the masse, which Praier is vsed, when the Mysteries are not yet Ce-

teined. Therefore vndoubtedly the meaning is not one in them both, concerning Benedicere Sancta, which is referred to so distinct Tymes and Conditions, And your Craftines may be espied which would destroy one Trueth by an other.

The Answer which M. Jewel maketh is this: Benedicere Sancta, signifieth in S. Chrysostome a solemne Praier made to conclude the whole: Ergo, benedicere Sancta, that is, to blesse the holy thinges, doth not signifie in Leontius Historie, Consecration.

The 4. Example. Matth. 16. Petra.

Let vs come to an other Example. Our saviour saied vnto S. Peter, Thow art Peter, A Rocke, and vpon this Rocke wil I builde my Churche: Ergo, S. Peter was most fast sett aboue all other in worthinesse, and he was a most sure and Principal person in the building of Christ his Churche: Such, as by which, all the faithfull should be staied. which proueth his singular Prerogatiue.

But (saieth M. Jewel) Christ is the
Jew. 222. Rocke. who denieth it? Againe, The confession of S. Peter, is the Rocke. Neither this is denied. And to proue this, that no Catholike denieth, he lacketh no Authorities. But how foloweth this, that

because

because Christ is the Rock, therfore S. Peter is not the Rocke? Or because ỹ Church is builded on the faith of S. Peter, therefore it was not builded vppon the person which had that faith? By like Reason you might conclude, God is our King and our Father: Ergo, we owe not supreme Reuerence in their kinde, to our Prince, Or our Parents. which is nothing els, but by one Truth, to destroy an other: And for lacke of Understanding, And abundance of Presuming, neither to distinct duties and offices accordingly, neither to refraine from determining, that which we know not, ouer hastely. Otherwise it were quickly to be perceaued, that Christ is the Rocke by merite, S. Peter by mere mercy: Christ by Absolute Authority, S. Peter by meanes of Legacy: Christ before and aboue all other, S. Peter aboue al other, but yet after, and not before Christ. By which commodity of distinctions, those propositiõs which Protestantes faine to be contrary, one to ỹ other, will stand and agree well together.

By suche argumẽts al religion hathe bene confuted.

The briefe Argument of M. Jewels is this. The Roeke which Christ spake of to S. Peter, signifieth the cõfessiõ of S. Peters faith: ergo it signifieth not S. Peter confessing it.

The.b Example. Ambr. 2. Cor. 12.

An other Example. S Androw folowed our sauiour before S. Peter. And yet (saith S. Ambrose) Androw receiued not Primatum, the Primacie, but Peter.

Iew. 245

primatus

But, M. Iewel Answereth: It is easye to be shewed, that Primatus emong the olde fathers, is farre otherwise vsed, I meane, for any Superioritie or preferment before others. And this he proueth at large by Phrases of Speach vsed about Esau, about the Heretike Abbate Eutyches, or towardes any of the foure Patriarches. But what concludeth he?

Thinketh he, because the Primacy that Esau lost for a dish of pottage, was to wear a better cote then his felowes, or to syt highest at the Table, or to haue thrise or fiue times more meat for his part, then an other, or any other suche thing belonging to the honour of the first borne: that the primacy which S. Ambrose attributeth to S. Peter, may haue the very self same sense in it? Or, because Eutyches had a Primacie in his Abbey, may it therfore be lawfull for vs to imagine, that all the Apostles liued in one Cloister together, and that S. Peter was no more then an Abbate amonge them?

Beside

Beside this, if Primatus doth signify any Preferment, it serueth also to signify the Supremacy. And so, as you wishe that it should be taken in your sense, so should you iustly haue prouided for it, least it were taken in an other sense. And this truly had bene your part, (M. Iewel) to proue that S. Ambrose dothe not meane by S. Peters Primacie, the General Gouernmēt ouer al the worlde. As for the bare shewing of it, ỳ Primatus hath diuers senses, it is mete & cōuenient for a Scholemaster or maker of Dictionaries: but in an Answerer it is not resonable, except ther folow an Applicatiō thereof to his purpose. You loue allwaies to driue the Catholikes to the prouing side, knowing it to be safest & easyest for you, to stand stil at the denial of euery thing. And who so folishe that can not doe so?

If (saye you) this worde Primatus muste signifie that power and Gouerment, that M. Harding fantasieth: then must it folow of necessitie, that Esau, Eutyches, the bishop of Antioche, and the Bishop of Alexandria, had the Vniuersall power and Gouernmēt of the whole worlde. Iew. 145

As who should say, that the question had

bene, whether Primatus hath any moe significations then one: Or that D. Harding had taken vpon him, to proue that Primatus where so euer it be founde, must needes signifie the Supremacy of the B. of Rome.

No, (M. Iewel) let Primatus haue as manye diuers significations, as you haue deuises to confound A trueth, D. Harding obiecteth you, the testimony of S. Ambrose where it is plaine, that S. Peter had a Primacy. To this now make a direct answer, not by telling a long Tale & True inough of the Significations of Primatus, but in Applying them to the Purpose, and Instructing vs, in what one sense it is to be taken in S. Ambrose. And if you dare say, that he meant suche a Primacy, as Esau lost for a dishe of Pottage, Or such, as the Heretike Eutiches had in his Abbey, then shall we prouide an Answer for you. But whereas the very wordes themselues doe geue it, that it coulde not be so Simple a mater, (for S. Andrew, as euery other of ỹ Apostles, had Authority geuen him in the whole worlde, and yet the Primacie was bestowed vpon S. Peter only, of whiche it foloweth, that emong the chiefest he was the chiefe) what helpeth it you, to the Answering

swering of S. Ambrose, to declare that Primatus is taken for any Superiority or Preferment?

Againe whereas you can not denye it, but S. Peter had a Dignitie & Preferment aboue other, how wel should you haue don to Specify wherein it consisted? But you thinke it inough perchaunce, to shewe that you are not altogether vnlearned, and that you haue in your daies, Heard, Reade, and Seene many thinges. which in deede were inough to doe, if Christians might seke for their owne Praise only, and not the setting forth of the Trueth. but the case being other wise, content not your selfe herewith (M. Jewel) to play the bare parte of a Grammarian: nor thinke the office of an Answerer fulfilled, if in telling one Trueth, you destroy an other.

The Answer that M. Jewel maketh is this: Primatus doth signifie anye Preferment, Ergo, it signifieth not in S. Ambrose the Supremacie of S. Peter. Againe: Esau lost his Primacie for a messe of pottage, Ergo S. Peters Primacie was not an vniuersall Gouernment.

Now as I haue saide of this worde Primatus, so might I also of this word Principatus, The. 6j. Example.

Principatus. cipatus, Principalitie, which S. Auguſtine vſeth to Bonifacius Biſhop of Rome in theſe wordes: Who is he that knoweth not, that, that Principalitie of Apoſtleship, (which vndoubtedlye was in the See of Rome) is to be preferred before any Bishoprike that is? which place proving ſo euidently, that the See of Rome paſſeth in Dignitie what ſoeuer Biſhoprycke in the worlde, yet M. Iewel anſwereth, that it ſignifieth not here a Supreme Gouernment. Aſke him the cauſe why, and he can ſay no more but that,

Auguſt. de Bapt. cont Dō. lib. 2.

Iew. 249 Socrates is called Prince of Philoſophers, And Plato Prince of Oratours, And Pompeius Prince of the world, And Elias head of the Prophets. In which places, Princeps is taken, not for a Prince or Gouernour, but only, for A man that for his qualities is to be eſtemed aboue the reſt. And in this ſenſe S. Auguſtine calleth the See of Rome, as it was in his time, principatum ſedis Apoſtolicæ.

Well Sir, that, Princeps is often vſed for A man had in eſtimation for his vertue, rome, or any ſingular qualitie, euery Grammarian can witneſſe. But that it is alwais ſo vſed, who telleth you? And excepte you proue that it hath no other Signification beſyde, how

how can you inferre, that because Socrates is called Prince of the Phylosophers in respect of his knowledge, so the See of Rome shoulde be called Princeps or chiefe in respect of some qualitie only, (you tell not what) and not of Supreme Gouernment. For Supreme Gouernment it self, is it not a certain qualitie? And Pompeius whome your selfe name as Prince of the world, though he were so in deede: in respect either of Vertue or Office, yet was he not Supreme Gouernour. How hangeth this Tale then togeather, that Princeps is not taken for a Chiefe Gouernour, because it is often vsed to signifie an Estimation aboue others in vertue. &c? Or who woulde euer so confounde a Trueth by a Trueth, but he that loueth not the Trueth?

Like Germans Lippes.

I woulde aske you allso (M. Iewel) what qualitie that should be in the Apostolike See of Rome, for which it shoulde be preferred aboue other Bishoprickes of all the worlde? It is not (you say) for Supreme Gouernmẽts sake. wherefore then? Is it for Estimation of vertue, Eloquence, Philosophy or any such like? Name the quality if you can: but you can not.

Only you stay vpon the Negatiue, that it had not the Principalitie because of Supreme Gouernment: And to that you adde that Princeps is taken, in the places which you allege, only for a man that for his qualities is to be esteemed. As wel you might proue, (M. Iewel) that Socrates was not Prince of Philosophers, because Princeps is taken oftentimes for A Chiefe Gouernour in A country, which Socrates neuer was.

See then (indifferent Reader) whether this be an honest and plaine maner in answering, to refell one Trueth by an other, Or so to deny one Sense of A word, that he can not tell, what other Sense of the same worde, to folow? Surely where M. Iewels senses in this matter should be, I can not tel. For like as when we say, Socrates is the Prince of Philosophers, we are vnderstanded to make the Comparison betwene him and other Philosophers, and not to meddle with Oratours, Captaines, Artificers, Or any of a diuers state and condition: So, when S. Augustin witnesseth, that the Principalitye of the Apostleship (which is in the Sea of Rome,) is to be preferred before all other what so euer Bishoprikes, what

what wise man doubteth, but that ỹ Comparison here is to be made, betweene the degrees of Power and Charge that are lesser or greater in that kinde of Office? Now by a Bisshopricke, what is imported? Is not a Spirituall Function and Charge ouer Soules vnderstanded thereby? And in this Charge are not Archbysshoppes aboue Bisshopes, and Patriarches aboue Archebisshopes? But in what thing aboue? In Iurisdiction vndoubtedly, & Gouernment, larger then their Inferiour haue.

Therefore, if the See of Rome, doe passe in Principalitie, all other Bisshoprikes (as S. Augustine witnesseth) And if the Superiortie or Inferiortie in Bisshoprikes must be considered according to the greatnesse or smalnesse of the Iurisdiction whiche is appointed to them (as the Definition of the Name will declare) howe should not the See of Rome haue an vniuersall Authoritie or Gouerment ouer al Christendome, which hath such a Principalitie geauen it, that all other Bisshoprikes are not comparable vnto it?

Not comparable, I meane, in those thinges, that perteine to Authoritie and Gouernment, suche as is annexed to the Condi-

Condition, Substance, or Nature of Bisshoprikes. For in Vertue, Policie, Eloquence, Fauor of Emperours, Abundance of Riches and Reuinges, and many other like thinges which are Personal or Temporal, the Bisshoppes of Constantinople may far excell the Pope. Yea, in such Bisshoply and Spirituall things also, as concerne their Character and Order, euery Bisshope in the world, doth Baptise, Confirme, Absolue and Consecrate as perfitely and excellently as the B. of Rome. But yet for all this, concerning the examininge and practising of these selfe same thinges which by Vertue of their order they maie doe, and concerning the power of Jurisdiction, As, to plant and to pul vp, to Cite, to dispense, To Forbidde, to Commaunde, To prescribe Orders, To determyne doutes, and so furth: what so euer Bisshoprike it be, The Principalitie of the Apostleshippe, that is in Rome, muste be preferred. And what lacketh then here, to Supreme Gouernmēt concerning causes Ecclesiasticall? Howe lilte also muste it be, to passe all others in Degree of Bisshoprike, if anie one were exempted from him?

The

The greater & fouler is your fault therfore (M. Jewell) whiche woulde make your Reader beleue, that the Principalytie of ỹ Apostolike See of Rome, in respect of other Bisshoprikes, consisteth in any other Qualytie (what, you can not tell) and not in Supreme Gouernment. whereas, in Comparinge of Byshoprike with Byshoprike, the Authoritie of Gouernment is directly to be considered.

The Answer of M. Jewell is this. Princeps is often vsed for a man had in estimation for any Vertue, Roome, Or Singular Qualitie: Ergo, the Principalytie whiche S. Augustine attributeth to the Apostolike See consisteth not in Supreme Gouerment.

It woulde be ouer longe and tedious, to reken vp all Examples, by whiche I might euidently confirme, this obiection of myne, that Maister Jewell vseth the settinge furthe of one Trueth, to the disgracinge or dissanulling rather of an other. As when the Catholikes say, to proue the Supremacie of the Bisshope of Rome:

Iulius restored Athanasius: The. viij Example.

M. Jewell Answereth: Maximus also restored vnto him, his Communion. Iew. 290

when

The viij. Example. when they say: *Touching faith and Religion the See of Rome hath alwaies bene consulted:*

Iew. 294 **He Answereth:** Marcellinus, Dulcitius, Bonifacius, Euodius and other sent theyr questions to S. Augustine.

The. ix. Example. when they say: *S. Peter was called, Princeps or Chiefe of the Apostles:*

He Answereth: So we reed in Scriptures, PrincepsFamiliæ, PrincepsLegationis, Princeps Coquorum, that is, the Chiefe of rhe
Iew. 302. house or stocke, the Chiefe of the Embassage, the Chiefe of the Cookes.

The. x. Example. when the Catholikes say: *S. Peter the Master of the whole world apointed S. Iames to be Bis-*
Iew. 303 *shope of Hierusalem:*

He Answereth: That vnto Michael is committed the nation of the Iewes. But, Land and Sea, and all the habitation of the world, is committed to S. Paule.

The. xj. Example. when they say, that *Rome is the moste notable and chief Church of the worlde:*

He

He Answereth that, Cicero to blase the nobilitie of that Citie, calleth lucem orbis terrarum, atque arcem omnium Gentiũ, the light of the world and the Castle of all nations. Iew. 304

To make an end, when they say out of S. Ambrose, *That Damasus the Pope is called the Rector and Ruler of the house of God:* The xij. Example.

To put the mater out of al doubt, see what he answereth therevnto.

But to put the mater out of doubt, let vs consider whether the selfe same forme of Speach, haue bene applied to any others in like sorte. And then he telleth where other Bisshopes haue bene sayed to be Rulers in the Church. Iew. 306

But doth this kinde of Answer, either satisfie the Obiection, Or Determine the Tryeth, Or quiet a doubtful minde? Doth not this kinde of Reasoning bring vs rather into perplexities, that it may not be knowen, how to be resolued in any mater? Is there any fitter waye for the Antichrist to worke by, then, by Forme and Phrases of Speache, to confound all Faith and Religion? An high way for Antichrist

Doe you beleue (M. Iewel) that Christ is the Sonne of God? But doe you beleue that

that he is the naturall Sonne of his Father, of the same Substance & Eternitie with him? If you doe so in deede, what say you to this Argument, that Iudges in ỹ Scriptures are called Goddes, and that, the frindes and Seruantes of God, are called Goddes? would this put the mater out of doubt, that Christe is not the Sonne of God (I meane by Nature) because you coulde finde it oute (after you had considered it) where the selfsame form of speache is applied to others in like sort? And where suche, as are not the naturall Children of God, are called yet the Children of God?

Ex. 22

psal. 81.

Christ saueth vs, & in Form of Speache S. Paule sayeth to Timothie: Doeinge so, thou shalt saue thy self, and them that heare thee. And would you conclude herevpon, that the Power of sauinge is all one in them bothe, because the Forme of the worde, is all one? Or that it is not properly and worthely verifyed of Christe, because it is but improperly attributed to S. Timothie?

1. Tim. 4.

Consider then I praie you (M. Iewel) whether this will put the mater oute of doubt, if in Refelling the Sense of some one place whiche pleaseth you not, you bring

bringe a lyke Forme of Speache vsed in an other place: And without further probation, require to haue the vnderstandinge which your Aduersaie gathereth of his witnesse, to be reformed accordinge to the meaninge of the Sentencies which you allege: As, because Princeps, that is Chiefe, is vsed in bothe places, whether you say Princeps Apostolorum, or Princeps Coquorum: Therefore to conclude, that the Chiefrie of S. Peter Emonge the Apostles, was no other thinge then the Chiefrie of M. emonge the Cookes.

Beware therefore (Christen Reader) of M. Jewell, And especially in those places: whiche as they make moste for the Catholyke Faith, so hath he no other refuge for sauinge hym selfe from Subscribinge vnto them, but this very Simple one and Feeble, to seeke where lyke Phrases may be founde of an other Sense yet and meanynge, thereby to bringe in to doubt (or as he supposeth) to putte out of doubte, that the Sense of the Catholykes Obiection can not contynue. whiche, in fewe wordes, is no other, then to shewe hymselfe A Grammarian only.

And

And to destroie one trueth by an other, as though. One phrase might not haue two good Senses, eche one agreeing with the place in which they are apointed to serue.

The sum of M. Jewels Argument is this: The like forme or phrase of speache is to be found in an other sense: Ergo, to put the mater out of doubt, this Present place (of whith the question is) hath not a different or sundrie sense frome that other.

The Summe of my meaning, is this: that no man be deceaued through this kind of M. Jewels Answering, wherein, he so telleth one Trueth, that he disswadeth an other. This practise of the Protestates hath already done harme inough. let them beginne rather to amend, theyr former iniquites, then to adde fresshe vnto them.

They haue answered: God must be worshipped in Spirite: which is most true, and haue thereby taken awaie an other trueth, that, *God is also to be worshipped with our body and bodily thinges.*

They haue answered: The true Fast is to abstaine frome Synne. whiche is vndoubteely True: but by that faire shew of pure holynes, they haue Destroied an other Trueth,

Trueth that, *Togeather with the fasting from synne, we must also take paynes in our body, and abstaine now and then, from meate and drinke.*

Thei haue Answered: We must receiue the body of Christ by faithe, which in some sense is most true. But thei haue therewithal taught the people, not to beleue the Real presence of Christ in the Sacrament: which presence yet is as true, as the other is certaine.

In other cases moe, they haue done the lyke. It is to much that thei haue already done: let them not therefore continue in this trade of Answering, nor of dealing in maters of Religion. Specially when thei bring the mater, to Phrases of Speache, and Signification of wordes, and by one Sense take awaie an other, whereas bothe in their seuerall places doe agree with Truthe: this kynd of handeling or Tumblyng rather of thinges, the more further of it is, from the Common Capacitie and iudgement of the Reader, ꝑ sorer it trobleth his conscience, & ꝑ harder it is to be remedyed. For the lesse he is able to examine it, the more he mistrusteth,

when he seeth many wordes made on the contrarie side about it: and by ẏ same reason, because he lacketh the lernyng and Intelligence, he wil not so easely conceiue what is told hym, or perceiue what is what in the question.

For, like as you M. Iew. haue now instructed vs, in the significations, of Missa, Princeps, Principalitie, and Rector: so, if an other would teach vs, as concernyng the Motherheade of our blessed Lady, The excellencie of Christ, the Resurrection of our flesshe, ẏ A Mother, Christ, & flesshe, signifie not alwaies a natural mother, Or the Sauiiour of the world, or this sensible and palpable flesshe: would it not cost vs so many wordes in ẏ tcfelling of it, & cause vs so narowly to examine, euery circumstãce aboute it, ẏ ẏ common reader should either not intẽd, for slewth or wearynes, to cõsider it, Or not be hable to perceaue it, or if he dyd, to saie yet to himselfe, Byr Lady, this geare is not so cleare and manifest, but argumentes maie be found out against it? To what purpose then is it, to peeke vp phrases only, & to geue vs the sundrie significatiõs ōly of wordes? Surely to no other end, thẽ to bring in a confusion. In so much, ẏ a man shal not be able to affirme any thing almost, be it neuer so

manifeſt, but by ẏ lyke frat a Replie wil be made againſt it. Is it not true at this preſent, that you (M. Iew) ſtand for a Biſhop of Sarum? Let ſo much then be writen vnto Geneua, And let the brothers there, Reioyſe, and Praiſe the Lord for it, that ſo letned and Feruent a Miniſter is ſet ouer the congregation. But in the begynning of their ioy, if it ſhould be ſaied ſadly vnto them, that they were not beſt to be ſo glad before they be ſure thereof, becauſe A Biſhope is not alwaies taken for a preacher of the word, or miniſter of the Sacramentes, but ſignifieth ſometymes a man which for any ſingular Qualities ſake, hath a Charge & ſight ouer any thinge committed vnto him &c. would not this obiection, let ẏ furth goeing and courſe of their gladnes? No doubt thereof. For by that tyme his needleſſe talke were anſwered, and he for al ẏ would replie againe, that it foloweth not Neceſſarily, M. Iew. to haue any ſpiritual office in ẏ he is reported to be a Biſhope, becauſe Cicero himſelf in his Epiſ. vſeth a lyk word to a far other ſēſe, it would make ſome to doubt of ẏ mater, & other to marueil at ẏ putting vp of ẏ doubt, & euery one to be troubled w̄ ſome affectiō either w̄ it or againſt it, the end therefore wil be cōfuſiō.

I speake not here against distinctions: neither can I mislyke with his diligence, that when one word is taken sundrie waies, doth set euery sense of the worde in his proper Place. But this is that, which would be amended in M. Iewel, that in Reasoning against vs, he be not content to tel vs Barely, that Princeps, or principatus, or Rector is vsed dyuerslye: but that he declare, in what one sense it must be taken, concernyng that place about which our question ys, Or in what other sense, then that which we doe take it in Otherwise: If the question were, *VVhether any Masse be, at this daie, saied in Rome*: we affirmyng, that there ys: He Replieth in deede, when he Answereth, that, Missa is taken for any kind of Praier. but, if he addeno more, and if he cã not saie, in his conscience that the Masse at Rome is such a kynde of Praier only, he Replieth but lyke A Sophist, and maintenyeth only a Cõtradiction, to ẏ increase of Contention. And, neither will he yelde to our proposition, because he replieth against it, neither doth he deny our proposition, because it is but a Truth which he saieth, and therefore nothing contra-

contrarie to that of ours: Neither wil he applye his owne sense of the word Missa (or what so euer other it be) to the question proponed, but like a man not only Amased hymselfe, but that would haue al other to be vncertaine in euery mater, so he leaueth it as he found it in some note boke or Lexicon, that Missa, Princeps, Principatus, are taken not alwaies in one Sense. Beware therefore of hym.

Of the Courteous, Mylde & Gentle, behauiour of M. Iewel towardes D. Harding.

CAP. IX.

YOur frindes (M. Iew.) beleue it, & your self doe also acknowledge it: ẏ you haue dealt in this cõflict wᵗʰ D, Har. very honestly & modestly. And, if they chink so, I maruel not, because a good will is so readie, to alow ẏ Praises of hym whom it liketh, ẏ of euery occasiõ, it doth admit ẏ persuasion, ẏ leadeth there vnto. In so much, ẏ without further Loking into your Boke, & Considering of ẏ Specialties, it is vnto some a plaine Demonstration, ẏ you are of a very Quiet & Gentle Spryte, because you haue charged

your aduersarie only with Untruethes, and abstained from the Terme of Lies.

Wherein, though they be greatly deceaued (because in dede, in doeing your worst, you could neuer haue rightly called them Lies, which shalbe shortly proued, to be not so much as, Untruethes) yet are they easely to be pardoned, because it is A common mater in good Natures & dispositions, quickly to be moued with the shew of Vertue and honestie, without long tarying and further trial, whether it be true or Counterfaite. But:

As for you, M. Iewel, it is great wōder, not, that you speake Sweetly and meane bitterly, or speake sharpely and think it Truely: but, ẏ you doe pretend Modestie and practise Extremitie, shewing in wordes, as though either you had no Choler at all, either kept it downe from Inflammations, And in deedes expressing such passions, as declare exceding copie of bitter humors. I wil not (you say at the begynning) Answer heate for heat, but in such kinde of Eloquence, wil rather geaue place.

Iew. 6: Gentle M. Iew. 42.

And againe: No, No, M. Iewel triūpheth not, but geueth al triumph, victorie, & glorie vnto God. & in an other place: Of my arguments I make no Vaunt. If they sound wel

79.

in Gods eares, they are wel in tuene.

Doe not these phrases and ỳ like declare, the man to be much mortified, that vseth them? And, that he is so far of from geauing Reproche or Taunt of his owne making: that he will not so much as vse the occasion, when it is offred, or requite lyke with lyke, being prouoked?

And who is he so perfite by his owne Testimonie? Forsoth M. Iewel. And that M. Iewel, which (bysyde those forsaied behauiours, of which I haue spoken) spareth not to cal men Iannizers, Renegates, Robbers of the people, and deceiuers of them in al cumfort, Blind Guides, Soueraigne Heretikes, Wilful Deuisers, Against their owne knoulege, violently to repel ỳ institutiõ of Christ, Deniers of Christs institution, Improuers of Gods commaundement, Men that vse scorneful and sclaunderous tales. That M. Iewel, which chargeth them with, Wilful malice, Hatred of trueth, Childisſh fables, Lies & sclaunders, Vaine folie, and Manifest falsehoode.

Iew. pa. 2. 3 Modest M. Iew. 55 96 114 118 2 3.

Euen ỳ Iewel, which sayeth of the Bishopes of Rome (to let goe other, as fauorable & gentle wordes towardes thẽ) ỳ as Iulianus ỳ Emperour in his phrenesie, some

tymes imagined ẏ ẏ greate Alexãders ſoule was come by ſucceſsiõ to dwel in him: euẽ ſo now the bishopes of Rome Imagine by like phãtaſie or phreneſie, ẏ S. Peters ſoule cometh by ſucceſsiõ to dwel in thẽ. **Such Priuilege & grace he hath boldly to ſet furth ſo Incredible & Slaunderous Lies: & yet to be taken for a Quiet and Peaceable man.**

But againſt Strangers & Foreners, he is (you wil graunt) ſomewhat Ernest and zelous: Marye towardes D. Har. his old acquaintance & countriemã, he is very ſober & tẽperate. So I trow, as by theſe his familiar Termes it will appeere.

Iew: pag. 1.

4
5

He laith to D. Har. charge, Cauils, Intẽperat humors of ſpeaking euil, Inflaming of his choler, Villanie, Vnhoneſt coũtenãce, wicked wilfulnes, Wãtõ foly, Wel broking of his owne lerning, Bringing of blind Geaſſes, Skorning, & ẏ as his maner is, Wilful renoũcing of gods knowẽ truth, Preſuming of his owne wit and eloquence, Brauery, Oſtentatiõ of lerning, Groſſe error, Põpe of words, New fantaſy, Kind of lerning not only peuiſh, but alſo fãtaſtical & mere frãtike, Refreſſhing himſelf with one pore ſillable, leuing his lerning vtterly, & holding by bare Gheaſſes as he cõmonly doth, Speaking only by authoritie and puing nothing, as his maner is, Narow ſeking to

See 14
ſwhat 19
ſtore 23
He hath kept vn 73
to him= 79
ſelfe for 84
al his 85
leauing ſuch 129
kind 165
of Eloquẽce 149
vnto his 254
aduer= ſarie. 39. 106 112

king to finde ſome couert for his errour: 122.
Leauing ẏ whole rout of his cõpanie, & glad 127
nes to run alone, Blindnes, Bitternes of 145
talk inflamed & Malice, wherof it ſemeth he 172
wanteth no ſtore: Wantonly denying of 174
Chriſt, Amaſing of the ignorant Reader wᵗ 175
a countenance of great learning: Faction, 181
Cõtẽtiõ, Mainteyning of vntruth, cõtrary 217
to his own knowledge, Doctrine ſeruing 219
only to maintein Ignoráce & the kingdõ of 232
darknes, Liking of thoſe authorities aboue 269
al others, which are moſt vain & ſhamles a- 284.
boue al others, Manifeſt corruptiõ and fal-
ſifiẽg of Doctours, Purpoſely corrupting
both the Greke & the Latine of Socrates.

These wordes be yours, M. Iew. not only for ẏ they be vttered by you: but alſo, for that they perteyne directly & properly vnto your ſelf. With theſe and other like pearles (As a Ieweller abunding in ſuch Pretiouſnes) ye haue thoroughly beſett your whole boke, ẏ it might ẏ more glitter in ẏ eie of your reader. Herewᵗ your Stage is fully freight. Some man would think, it were Vetus Comœdia: But it is not Abſolutely ſo, becauſe ye admitt vnto your Stage the Nouam alſo. And like A cunning and wiſe Plaier, ye temper one humour diuerſely, keeping ſtill ẏ ſharpenes

of

of your sense and meaning, but expressing it not alwayes vncourteously. For lyke a good natured & nurtered aduersary you order sometymes D. Harding manerly & shamefastly, As: This argument is very weake, I wil not say it is vnlerned or proceDeth of ignorance. Againe: If it be, either ỹ violence of nature, or the maner of his Catholike doctrine, that dryueth M. Harding thus to taunt, he must be borne withal. And againe: O what meaneth M. Harding thus to deale? Lothe I am to make the cõparison, but true it is: very children doe not vse to reason in so Childish sort. Againe: If I List to vse his owne termes, I might wel cal this, foisting or cogging, or I know not what.

Iew. pa. 17.
Iew. 104
Tender Compassion.
104
215.

Lo what a kind hart here is: He wil not saie ỹ he may say, he wil beare w̃ his aduersarie. Loth he is, to doe ỹ he doth. If he List, he could be sharper. As who should think, M. Iew. of hymself surely is of A Sweete & Gentle dispositiõ, he inflameth not his Choler, not because he hath none: but either he wil not, either he is loth, either he listeth not. He answereth not heate for heate, not only because he promised so: but euen of very pure mildenes of Spyite, and Moderation. Yet sauing for the ciuilitie

in

in vtterance, al in effect is one: whether one say, he lyeth, or sauing his reuerence he lyeth. And I lyke M. Iew. no better whē he saieth:

Loth I am to make the Comparison, but true it is, very childerne doe not vse to reason in so childish sort: than when he goeth plainely to worke without dissimulation, calling it, Lewd Logike, that D. Har. vseth, And with these Phrases disgracing his sayinges: This Argument is much acrased, It is vtterly vnsensible and voyde of reason, It halteth downe right of one syde, It hangeth only vpon lacke of cariage, A very Childe may lone see throught it, It is a good Frydayes Argument: Againe: This conclusion is faint, It is single sould &c. For both wayes the aduersary is greuously touched. Yea rather, where by other Signes it is plaine and euident, that D. Harding is nothing at all spared, there to pretend A Good Countenance and a Quiete Affection: it is the more bitter and odious.

Iew. 203. 204 164 245 60. where now is Loth I am, and he must be borne withal. 166. 129 216. 135. 65. 137. 263. Iew. 308.

What meane you by these wordes M. Iew: here by ye way, I must put M. Har. in remēbrance, notwithstāding for his estimatiō sake, he would faine haue his foorth in these matters

matters: Yet ſhould he not therefore thus beguile the eies of the ſimple, & thus myſ-reporte and falſifie the wordes of the auncient Fathers? Doe you not herein charge him with high Pride, extreme Crueltie & wicked falſehoode? when you call him
198 Somwhat ſhort witted, & obiect againſt him
29.26 wicked wilfulneſſe, Wanton folie, Bro-
54. 143 king of his owne lerning, and tell hym that His worde is not yet Canonized, And, that his worde is no Charter: doe ye not Accuſe him, by theſe wordes, vnto ỹ world & condemne hym or contẽne him in your owne hart, for a Solemne, arrogant, high mynded, Foliſhe, Light and Vnſkilful man?

This being then ſo euident, ỹ you nothing regarde hym, when ſo euer you ſpeake ſo Courteouſly as though in deede you had no Diſdaine or Choler: it is, to ỹ betraieing of your Craft and Hypocriſie, & no proſe at all of your Sinceritie or modeſtie. Neither doe you miſlike the ſharpe & bitter Termes, becauſe of an inward humilitie of your owne, & erneſt Imitation of Meeknes: but becauſe you ſhall make your aduerſaries ſayings appere ỹ more Feruent, ỹ more quietnes in Anſwering your ſelf doe Pretend and Counterfaicte.

Imaruell

I maruell (say you) M. Harding being so graue a man, would borow Ruffians Termes to scof withal. This you say, because he vsed the Termes of Cogging and Foisting ỹ die. And to make this more odious, you extoll the Grauitie of your aduersarie on ỹ one side, & increase ỹ vilenes of ỹ termes on ỹ other side: as though thei could neuer haue ben lerned but of Ruffians. And betwene these Extremes, your self stand a marueyling, as if you should think: Surely if it were to me, I would neuer vse such Methaphores, as are taken of Shamefull Occupations. Iew. 173. M. Iew. Maruel.

But, If these Termes offend you (M. Iewell) why call you them out of season to memory? why are you not content nō once noting of so Graue A man for them, but againe and againe repete them, out of Tyme and Place: I might (saie you) cal this Foisting or Cogging. Likewise, Here might M. Harding well bestow his termes, here might he truely saie, the pope coggeth and foisteth. Doth this Cogging of your Aduersary, become your Modestie? Or, is it for loue of Meekenes and Puritie, that you can not abide the wordes which are vsed in some Art or Feate of small Honestie? I would or might conceine Iew. 225 235.

so

so much, if your self practised not the contrary. For when you say:

Iew. 65. Iew. 225. 269 124 160 Maruel at your selfe 198 M. Iew. 221 225 237 240 299 302.

He heweth and Mangleth Chrysostomes words, He Mangleth and Maimeth S. Gregories wordes, He Shuffleth in wordes, Now haue an eie Good Reader to M Har. fingers, And marke how he Iuggleth with S. Augustines wordes, Onlesse thou eie him wel, he wil steal from thee, He Plaieth roūd about, merely, with his owne phātasie, Here M. Har. saieth, he wil trip & Daunce lightly ouer the Doctours, Was he staied with the Choinecough? Non satis commodè diuisa sunt tēporibus tibi Daue hæc. He bringeth in Councels in a Mummery, O what Ranging and Hunting here is to beate vp that thing, that wil not be found? He cummeth in only with ioly Brags and Great vauntes as if he were Playing at Post, and should wynne al by Vieinge: when you say all this (M. Iewel) in half your Booke only, bysides that which I haue already spoken, and that which I haue left vntouched: Into what cumpanie shall I say you haue fallen, to borow these Termes of them to skof withall? what Hewers, Ruffians, Shufflers, Iugglers, Tumblers, Daūcers, Dauyes, Mummers, Rangers,

Rangers, and Cardeplayers Haue you mette withall: of whom you should borow fit Termes for expressing of your Gentle Affections?

Iew. in his answer to D. Har. preface. Matth. 11. In Holy Lesson.

Doubtlesse (you say) such kinde of dealing, as is without gal or bitternes, as it is most commendable in it self: so it seemeth most sitting in them, that trauaile in Gods cause. Christ saieth, Learne of me: for I am meeke and Gentle. You therefore which know so much: with what Spirite haue you multiplied your Reprocheful Metaphores, against D. Harding? Or how speake you, against Ungentle and Sharpe Termes: your self in this very forsayd place (where of purpose you frame your talke to a singular forme of modestie) calling by craft, a man of Professed grauitie, as your self acknowledge, A SCORPION, & obiecting vnto him, his vnquiet IANNIZERS? And in ỹ next leafe, that He thinketh al the world singeth SANCTVS, SANCTVS, & receaueth hym with OZANNA. Is this your Remembring of that Good Lesson of Christ, which you teach D. Har. Learne of me, for I am meeke & gētle? Cometh this, of your Smoth and Calme Affections? Doe you stand fast and quiet vpon the Shoare?

Quickly forgotten.

Thinke

Thinke you D. Harding, for calling you Goliath, Therſites &c. to be blowen out by the tempeſtes of his affectiõs and to be toſſed from the ſhoare: And were you in no ſtorme at all, when the Sprite moued you to ſay, that with thoſe wordes he Solaceth himſelf, and Refreſſheth his Sprites?

Your ſelf (M. Jewell) are not a meete man to geaue Rules, Or to geane ſentẽce in theſe maters, being ſo Eger and Light of mynd: that neither ye haue any ſtaie of your ſelf, Nor yet doe refraine, from cõmending your ſelf of Modeſtie. But, if there be emoug your brothers any ſo perfitt, that can tell, When, Where and in What ſort &c. the Aduerſarie may be ſharpely ſpoken vnto, And can ſhew vs an Example thereof, in his owne writinges: let hym put his Concluſions, and we ſhall ſone be at a point, to know what behauiour we may boldly folow, when the cauſe it ſelf geaueth vs to reproue you. As for ſuch humblenes and Meekenes that a man ſhould not in any caſe call, an Heretike an Heretike, Or an Hypocrite an Hypocrite: wel it may be perchaũce ỹ counſell of ſome indifferẽt man,

man, which neither loueth ỹ one opinion nor hateth the other: but precept and Commandement of God, it is not. Our Sauiour hym selfe without any Inflaming of his Choler, vsing the Termes of Hypocrite, Blinde Guides, Fox, and Dalbed Sepulchres: And the Apostles after him, not sparinge to name suche as deserued it, Naughtie Beastes, Idle Belies, Dogges, Clowdes without water, Antichristes & cæt. Math. 15. 13. & 23. Tit. 1. Phil. 3. Iud. epis. 1. Io. 2.

Perchaunce therefore, if the mynde be Simple, and the harte vncorrupted, and if the Reproche which we geaue, be truely occasioned of our Aduersaries sayeinges or doeinges, and not inuented of our selues: our whole Acte, is out of daunger. But this I am sure of, that it becummeth not him, which wil be Exacte against others in such maters, and take vpon him the Countenance of a Quiete, Gentle, Courteous, Patiente, and holy man: to offend more extremely in ỹ same kind of thing, for which he misliketh with others. And because, you are so Reported and Praised (M. Iewell) to deale in this your Reply, very Modestly and Charitable, like A man that sayeth lesse then he could, And that fauoreth the estimation of his Aduersarie, choosing ra-

ther to diminisshe somewhat of that fyer which is enkindled, than to adde more mater vnto it: I thought it expedient to declare A Parte of such Notes and Signes, by which it may be perceaued, that for all the faire shewe of a good Complexion inwardly, yet you be full of ill humors. And that, notwithstanding the sweete Spryte, that fauor reporteth to come from you, you are so bitter and sower in Experience, that the Reader needeth aduertisement, To BEWARE Of you.

It foloweth now, shortly to declare, in what sort M. Iewell hath abused many other, with whome he hath to doe in his Replie. I meane, not only Auncient Councels or Fathers within the First six hundred yeres, but any kinde of Writer, whose Testimonie he vseth or Refuseth. His Contradictions also, his Grosse Errours or Heresies, And the Places or Argumentes, which for all his Greate Replie, he hath not Answered, they would not be left vntouched. But, because these pointes, though I mynd, but shortly, to note them, will occupie more tyme and Paper, then, at this present, I thinke good to tarie, or this

this Boke wil commodiously beare, beinge already of a sufficient bignesse: I wil therfore put it ouer to A Third Boke. which if it should, either not come furth at all, Or more slowly come furth, then either my intent surely and purpose is, Or thy desire perchaunse and expectation wil be: yet doe I leaue this, in the meane time, sufficiently proued, that M. Iewel is, in deed, suche a man, as of whome thou oughteste to BEWARE, though in worde, he seemeth to be one of the moste vprighteste Protestantes, that in these dayes, laboreth in the Englisshe Vineyarde.

For who so zelous as he, for settinge furth of the Procedinges? who so copious as he, in alleaging Auncient Fathers and Councels? who so stowte in challēging & bragginge? who so sweete in alluringe & flatering? what he is in Sermos by liuely vtterance, I neuer harde, or I haue forgotē: but what he is in his writings through a sadde and louing countenance, I see, and am both weary of it, and sory for it. For I find in his wordes so great reuerence & remembrance of God, so tender compassion and care of his Reader, that excepte I did certainely knowe it, by all his writtinges,

ỹ he dealeth vniuſtly, I might eaſely thinke it, ỹ he feareth God, & regardeth men.

Iew. in his Sermon.

I ſpeake not this (ſaieth he) in vehemency of ſprite, or heate of talke, but euen as before GOD, by the waie of ſimplicitie and truth, Againe: As truly as GOD is GOD & cæt.

In the 2. anſwer to D. Cole. pa. 101.

And againe in an other place of the ſame anſwer, I proteſte before God. And in this Reply, When I reade theſe wordes of M. Hardinges, I am ſtrikē with horrour, to conſider the terrible Iudgement of God: It is much to be feared that he that is lead awaie of this ſorte, offendeth not of Ignorance, for ſo were the faulte more pardonable, but againſte the manifeſte knowen trueth, and againſte the ſpirite of God.

Here loe in theſe phraſes is expreſſed the ſimilitude of A right good man, whiche continually walketh in the ſight of God, and hath ſuch conſideration of his maieſtie that the mind ſometimes being attentiuely ſet therupō, maketh (I can not tel how) much of ỹ corporal Spirite & ſenſe with it, and leaueth the body in an horrour.

Concerning then his affection towardes men: God graunt (ſaieth he) vnto all his people the Spirite of wiſedome and vnderſtanding & cæt. Againe. O good Reader, they deale not ſimple, they diſsimble, they

meane

meane it not. Againe, Alas this was no parte of S. Auguſtines minde. Beware good Reader, this man ſeeketh waies to deceaue thee. Againe. O good Chriſtian Reader, marke the dealing of this man, and Beware of hym. Againe. Take heede good Reader, M. Hardinge hath here throwen A greate Miſte of learning, to daſſle thy ſight.

Iew. pa. 5. 34. 124. 127.

Here loe againe ſuch Charitie and Conſcience is pretended, as though M. Iewel (good man) did hate nothinge more then deceauing of the Reader, and caſtinge of any myſte before his eyes: And that he ſo intendeth the Glorie of God, and wealthe of Soules, as though without any requeſt made vnto him, he did, for his parte, vterly denie his learning, denie his Biſshoprike, denie his eſtimation, denie his name, denye himſelfe: Only The Faith of Chriſt and the Truthe of God he could not deny.

In his anſwer to M. Hardinges preface

Yet, all theſe deuoute Affections, and Earneſt ſayinges notwithſtanding, thou ſhalt find him in deede ſo contrary vnto them, as though he cared neither for God nor for man. Remember (if thou haſt reade this boke) or Conſider (if thou wilte be aſſured) what Hypocriſie and Iniurie, he vſeth in the firſt Article, of priuate Maſſe: For whereas D. Harding reaſoned only

about Sole receauing, he draweth most violētly & wrōgfully, al his argumēts to saieing of Masse, of Receiuing vnder both kindes.

In the second Article, what A Trifler, and Shifter, and wrangler doth he shewe himselfe to be? First he stoutly saieth, The Communion in the primitiue Church was not ministred vnto the people in one kinde. If you proue the contrarie by some Examples, yea, saieth he, but it was not ministred so vnto the WHOLE PEOPLE: Againe, not in the OPEN CHVRCH. further yet, NOT ORDINARILY, and last of all, NOT AS IT IS NOW VSED & cæt.

In the third Article, of the Publike Seruice in the vulgare tounge? How Contentious & weyward is he? Nothing cā please him or satisfie him. Al ẏ D. Harding doth alleage is but Coniectures and Gheasses.

In ẏ fourth Article of the Supremacie, he calleth for the name of Vniuersal Bishop or Heade of the Church. And A name as good as ẏ, shal not suffise: the very Name it selfe, he must haue, or els the Catholikes (let them be sure thereof) shall here of it. As longe then, as the Name cometh not, he braggeth: when it cummeth in deede, he contemneth it, and sheweth how it was no greate maestrie to find it. So contenti-

ously

ously and so shamefully, as though th
were not A God whiche beholdeth
iudgeth our secret thoughtes, or as tho
it should not perteine to any mans Co
science, to care or passe muche vpon th
maters, but only to haue somewhat to
alwaies for him selfe, leaste he should ya
at any tyme to his Aduersarie.

Now, for the second boke, his Common
places and Digressions, his Abusing of
D. Harding so many waies, as I haue
specified, doe meetly wel proue (I thinke)
that he followeth not the plaine waye of
Simpliciti of Truth. If they do not, then let
some Charitable Protestant, deliuer me
of my opinion therein by answeringe my
Examples and Argumentes. If they
doe, I praie thē to remember themselues,
& either to moue M. Iewel to ỹ amending
of his faults, & ỹ Correcting yet once more
againe, of his Reply: or to make no more of
this which he hath done, then it deserueth.

But to make here an end: If my paines
doe bring any profite vnto thee (Indiffe-
rent Reader) I am sufficiently recompen-
sed for them, by the vantage which I shal
take of thy profite: If they bring none at
al, they yet cā not be al loste because of hym

EWARE OF M. IEWEL.

h considereth my Intent, & knoweth
oas for inst causes inqued to take these
ues. Being therefore myselfe out of all
ger of losse by this bargaine, for thee, I
y. him, ẏ thou also mayst winne some-
it, or if thy occupieing be not hitherto
e, ẏ thou shouldest loke to winne, yet I
pray God hartely, ẏ thou maiest not leese,
y is, to speake it more plainely vnto thee, ẏ
thou maiest BEWARE OF M. IEWEL.

Faultes escaped in the Printing.

Folio.	*Page.*	*Line.*	*Fault.*	*Correction.*
60.	2.	2	the	he
70.	1.	11.	lefte	let
86.	2.	4.	the	he
104.	2.	20.		put out (the)
116.	1.	6.	shifted	sifted
128.	2.	23.	Receaued	Receaue.
141.	2.	17.	muſt	moſt
75.	1.	14.	Cogging.	Egging.

Faultes in the Margent.

Pa.		
2.	ying	lying